

of the Associate

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
Evangelical Repository.

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION, AS SET FORTH IN THE FOR-
MULARIES OF THE WESTMINSTER DIVINES, AND OF THE
CHURCHES IN HOLLAND.

VOL. IX.

DECEMBER, 1832.

NO. 7.

CONTENTS.

	<i>page.</i>		<i>page.</i>
An Essay on the imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity,.....	385	Inability,.....	419
Reasons assigned for fasting on the occasion of the dreadful plague the Cholera, or, the sins of our times, (concluded from page 335.).....	399	Popery and Paganism,.....	425
On Divine Love,.....	405	The Synod of Philadelphia,.....	430
Psalmody,.....	414	Ruling Elders,	438
		J. Q. Adams' Opinion of Masonry,.....	445
		Scott's Family Bible,.....	448
		Ecclesiastical Record,.....	448
		To Patrons, Agents, &c. see back of cover.	

Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest to your souls.
JAN VI. 16.

EDITED BY A MINISTER OF THE ASSOCIATE CHURCH.

ALBANY:
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY CHAUNCEY WEBSTER.
Two sheets—octavo.

PROBATION DEPARTMENT

NOTED BY THE FINANCIALS. I AM RESPONSIBLE FOR SETTING UP THE FOR

100

1961-1962

1158

1. 1940-1941
2. 1942-1943
3. 1944-1945
4. 1946-1947
5. 1948-1949
6. 1950-1951
7. 1952-1953
8. 1954-1955
9. 1956-1957
10. 1958-1959
11. 1960-1961
12. 1962-1963
13. 1964-1965
14. 1966-1967
15. 1968-1969
16. 1970-1971
17. 1972-1973
18. 1974-1975
19. 1976-1977
20. 1978-1979
21. 1980-1981
22. 1982-1983
23. 1984-1985
24. 1986-1987
25. 1988-1989
26. 1990-1991
27. 1992-1993
28. 1994-1995
29. 1996-1997
30. 1998-1999
31. 2000-2001
32. 2002-2003
33. 2004-2005
34. 2006-2007
35. 2008-2009
36. 2010-2011
37. 2012-2013
38. 2014-2015
39. 2016-2017
40. 2018-2019
41. 2020-2021
42. 2022-2023
43. 2024-2025
44. 2026-2027
45. 2028-2029
46. 2030-2031
47. 2032-2033
48. 2034-2035
49. 2036-2037
50. 2038-2039
51. 2040-2041
52. 2042-2043
53. 2044-2045
54. 2046-2047
55. 2048-2049
56. 2050-2051
57. 2052-2053
58. 2054-2055
59. 2056-2057
60. 2058-2059
61. 2060-2061
62. 2062-2063
63. 2064-2065
64. 2066-2067
65. 2068-2069
66. 2070-2071
67. 2072-2073
68. 2074-2075
69. 2076-2077
70. 2078-2079
71. 2080-2081
72. 2082-2083
73. 2084-2085
74. 2086-2087
75. 2088-2089
76. 2090-2091
77. 2092-2093
78. 2094-2095
79. 2096-2097
80. 2098-2099
81. 2100-2101
82. 2102-2103
83. 2104-2105
84. 2106-2107
85. 2108-2109
86. 2110-2111
87. 2112-2113
88. 2114-2115
89. 2116-2117
90. 2118-2119
91. 2120-2121
92. 2122-2123
93. 2124-2125
94. 2126-2127
95. 2128-2129
96. 2130-2131
97. 2132-2133
98. 2134-2135
99. 2136-2137
100. 2138-2139
101. 2140-2141
102. 2142-2143
103. 2144-2145
104. 2146-2147
105. 2148-2149
106. 2150-2151
107. 2152-2153
108. 2154-2155
109. 2156-2157
110. 2158-2159
111. 2160-2161
112. 2162-2163
113. 2164-2165
114. 2166-2167
115. 2168-2169
116. 2170-2171
117. 2172-2173
118. 2174-2175
119. 2176-2177
120. 2178-2179
121. 2180-2181
122. 2182-2183
123. 2184-2185
124. 2186-2187
125. 2188-2189
126. 2190-2191
127. 2192-2193
128. 2194-2195
129. 2196-2197
130. 2198-2199
131. 2200-2201
132. 2202-2203
133. 2204-2205
134. 2206-2207
135. 2208-2209
136. 2210-2211
137. 2212-2213
138. 2214-2215
139. 2216-2217
140. 2218-2219
141. 2220-2221
142. 2222-2223
143. 2224-2225
144. 2226-2227
145. 2228-2229
146. 2230-2231
147. 2232-2233
148. 2234-2235
149. 2236-2237
150. 2238-2239
151. 2240-2241
152. 2242-2243
153. 2244-2245
154. 2246-2247
155. 2248-2249
156. 2250-2251
157. 2252-2253
158. 2254-2255
159. 2256-2257
160. 2258-2259
161. 2260-2261
162. 2262-2263
163. 2264-2265
164. 2266-2267
165. 2268-2269
166. 2270-2271
167. 2272-2273
168. 2274-2275
169. 2276-2277
170. 2278-2279
171. 2280-2281
172. 2282-2283
173. 2284-2285
174. 2286-2287
175. 2288-2289
176. 2290-2291
177. 2292-2293
178. 2294-2295
179. 2296-2297
180. 2298-2299
181. 2300-2301
182. 2302-2303
183. 2304-2305
184. 2306-2307
185. 2308-2309
186. 2310-2311
187. 2312-2313
188. 2314-2315
189. 2316-2317
190. 2318-2319
191. 2320-2321
192. 2322-2323
193. 2324-2325
194. 2326-2327
195. 2328-2329
196. 2330-2331
197. 2332-2333
198. 2334-2335
199. 2336-2337
200. 2338-2339
201. 2340-2341
202. 2342-2343
203. 2344-2345
204. 2346-2347
205. 2348-2349
206. 2350-2351
207. 2352-2353
208. 2354-2355
209. 2356-2357
210. 2358-2359
211. 2360-2361
212. 2362-2363
213. 2364-2365
214. 2366-2367
215. 2368-2369
216. 2370-2371
217. 2372-2373
218. 2374-2375
219. 2376-2377
220. 2378-2379
221. 2380-2381
222. 2382-2383
223. 2384-2385
224. 2386-2387
225. 2388-2389
226. 2390-2391
227. 2392-2393
228. 2394-2395
229. 2396-2397
230. 2398-2399
231. 2400-2401
232. 2402-2403
233. 2404-2405
234. 2406-2407
235. 2408-2409
236. 2410-2411
237. 2412-2413
238. 2414-2415
239. 2416-2417
240. 2418-2419
241. 2420-2421
242. 2422-2423
243. 2424-2425
244. 2426-2427
245. 2428-2429
246. 2430-2431
247. 2432-2433
248. 2434-2435
249. 2436-2437
250. 2438-2439
251. 2440-2441
252. 2442-2443
253. 2444-2445
254. 2446-2447
255. 2448-2449
256. 2450-2451
257. 2452-2453
258. 2454-2455
259. 2456-2457
260. 2458-2459
261. 2460-2461
262. 2462-2463
263. 2464-

06.11.1941

FORM NO. 1 (REV. 1-1-60)

STATE OF NEW YORK
IN SENATE
JANUARY 11, 1911.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
Evangelical Repository.

VOL. IX.

DECEMBER, 1832.

NO. 7.

[For the Religious Monitor.]

AN ESSAY

ON THE IMPUTATION OF ADAM'S FIRST SIN
TO HIS POSTERITY.

THE term, ORIGINAL SIN, was first introduced by Augustine, in his controversy with the Pelagians, as being a convenient and significant name for an article of truth, which had not till that time been controverted in the Christian Church. But, although Augustine ably defended the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity, yet by the term "original sin," he only designated the innate corruption of human nature; and he so designated it, not merely to express its derivation from our first original, but as being itself the *origin*, or fountain, from which proceed all actual transgressions. By the Reformers, this term was generally used in the same restricted sense; the imputation of the first sin being maintained by them under a distinct head of doctrine. The term, however, soon came to be used in a more extensive sense, including both the imputation of the first sin, and also the corruption of nature consequent upon that imputation. And lest there should be any confusion of ideas, or any subterfuge for opponents, created by such a comprehensive use of the term, it was distinguished into "original sin imputed," and "original sin inherent;" a distinction, which has ever since been carefully observed, by the generality of Calvinistic writers upon the subject. And the observance of this distinction is very necessary. For, there are many, who profess to hold the doctrine of original sin, who, when they come to explain themselves, only mean "original sin inherent," or native corruption, totally renouncing the idea of "original sin imputed," or the imputation of Adam's sin, as the ground of that corruption. When, therefore, we speak of original sin, in the following Essay, without

any qualification, we would be understood as including both these ideas.

Various have been the opinions of professed Christians in relation to original sin. The first departure from the Orthodox faith, on this subject, was made by PELAGIUS; about the beginning of the fifth century. Although, there had existed, in the church, disputes respecting almost all the other leading doctrines of Christianity, yet history gives us no hint of any discrepancy on this subject, until the time just specified. Pelagius, however, and his followers fiercely assailed the received doctrine of the church on this head, boldly maintaining, on the contrary, that man as born into the world, neither possessed a corrupted nature, nor was chargeable with the guilt of Adam's sin. This heresy was soon condemned by various ecclesiastical councils, through the energy and zeal of AUGUSTINE and other champions of the truth. But, although the doctrine of original sin was, at that time, triumphantly maintained by the church, yet during the long night of Papal darkness, which succeeded, it became corrupted to such a degree, that at the commencement of the Reformation, it was, in the mouths of Papists, an entirely different doctrine, from that which Augustine had so ably defended. At that period, the general belief in the Church of Rome was, that the *ill-desert* of Adam's sin was not imputed to his posterity; but only an exposure to the endurance of evils; and that, although man was now born destitute of positive holiness, yet he possessed no contrary habit of sin. Or, if it was allowed, that there was any thing sinful about the infant seed of Adam, the early administration of Baptism was supposed sufficient to wash it entirely away. In reforming, however, the doctrines of the church from the gross corruptions which a dark age had heaped upon them, the early Reformers were at particular pains to restore the doctrine of original sin to its primitive

purity. But soon new and deadly enemies to this doctrine sprung up. The SOCINIANS adopted the errors of Pelagius. Even the ANABAPTISTS derided this doctrine as "the figment of Augustine." The ARMINIANS followed the footsteps of the Socinians, and contended with them, "that man had lost nothing by the *fall*, had incurred no damage by the *fall*." After this QUAKERS and other fanatics sprung up amidst the Reformed churches, embracing the same perverted and anti-scriptural sentiments. The WESLEYAN METHODISTS, though on the whole *Arminian* in sentiment, yet, acknowledged a sinful corruption of nature, with a will, however, left free to the choice of good; but in regard to the guilt of Adam's first sin, so far as it had any bearing upon his descendants, they maintained that it was taken away by the death of Christ. There are many in this country, who, though they discard "original sin imputed," nevertheless maintain "original sin inherent," or an entire corruption of nature. And in this they are the followers of one Placcæus (de la Place) a French Professor, whose heresy was condemned by a National Synod, held at Charenton, A. D. 1644, in these words, "The Synod do condemn this doctrine, as it so restricts the nature of original sin to the hereditary corruption of Adam's posterity, as to exclude the imputation of that first sin, by which Adam fell; and do, therefore, determine that Pastors, Professors and all others be subjected to ecclesiastical censures, who, in discoursing on this doctrine, have departed from the common sentiment of the Reformed Churches, all of which have as yet acknowledged both *that* corruption and *this* imputation, as descending to all the posterity of Adam." This same doctrine, however, which was thus solemnly condemned by a Protestant Synod, in accordance with the universal sentiment of the Reformed Churches, has long existed among us, under the protecting and nourishing embrace of the HOPKINSIANS. But even that remaining portion of truth, on this subject, which the Hopkinsian tenet preserved to us, has been metaphysically murdered by the introduction of a new system, which indeed is not a new system, but an old system, which had its rise in the dark minds of a Pelagius and Socinus. This New Light, or New School system, as it is familiarly termed, and which is very extensively embraced by CONGREGATIONALISTS and PRESBYTERIANS, throughout our country, represents mankind as born into the world, to be neither holy nor unholy, neither charged with

Adam's guilt, nor tinged with any innate corruption; but placed, at the same time, under such a divine constitution, as will secure in them, the moment they arrive at the period of moral agency, a sinful choice; which sinful choice is made essential to the very being of sin. To this catalogue of opinions respecting original sin, it may be added, that among those who would be esteemed orthodox upon the subject, and firm adherents to the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms, there are many, who give such an explanation of the doctrine, as entirely destroys it, so far as the "imputation of Adams' first sin" is concerned.—Professing to believe, that "the guilt of Adam's first sin is imputed to all his posterity," by *guilt*, they only mean a *liability* or *exposure* to punishment, entirely excluding the idea of *ill-desert*; and hence they coincide, very exactly, with the doctrine of the Papists, as before noticed. And as this is the way, in which some individuals, who are considered at the *head* of Orthodoxy, in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, hold to the imputation of the *guilt* of Adam's sin, as mentioned in their Subordinate Standards, it may be noticed more particularly afterwards.

Such then are some of the sentiments, which have been, and still are entertained, on the very important subject of original sin. And, indeed, it may be safely affirmed, that at no former period of the Church, at least since the days of the Reformation, has this doctrine been so extensively corrupted, as at the present. And since it is "original sin imputed," which is so obnoxious to the multitude, so hated, derided and rejected, it is proposed in the following Essay to illustrate and establish *it*; and in so doing, the truth of "original sin inherent" will also, at the same time, be confirmed. But before proceeding directly to the accomplishment of this purpose, and as a proper foundation of the whole discussion, a brief exegetical view shall be taken of the following interesting portion of Divine Revelation.

Rom. v. 12—19. "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: (For until the law, sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come. But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead; much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, *which is* by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. And not as *it was* by one that sinned, *so is* the gift; for the judg-

ment *was* by one to condemnation, but the free gift *is* of many offences unto justification. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one, much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ :) Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."

This portion of God's Book, ever since it was written, has been considered by the advocates of the doctrine of "Original sin," as decisive on that subject. And indeed if that doctrine be not taught in this place, at least so far as it regards "the imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity," we might well bear with persons for not finding it elsewhere taught in the Holy Oracles. It behooves, therefore, every friend of truth to study this passage with an unprejudiced mind, with prayerfulness and care, that he may understand and "keep the sayings" of the Spirit of truth, which it contains.

This passage unites with the preceding context by the connecting particle, "wherefore." The precise idea which forms the basis of the connection is not so obvious—One thing, however, appears manifest, that the Apostle, in the verses quoted, undertakes to explain the *manner*, in which the righteousness of Christ comes to be the ground of a sinner's justification before God; or *how* ungodly and condemned sinners become righteous through his righteousness.—The Apostle had been treating largely of the doctrine of justification, and had fully established the point, that it is not by *works*, but by *faith*, that any child of Adam can become justified in the sight of a Holy God. But this free justification is owing to the finished work of our Lord Jesus Christ. Although persons are "justified freely by grace," yet it is "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood." Chap. iii. 24. In the first and eleventh verses of this chapter, we are said to have "peace with God," and to receive "the atonement" (reconciliation) "through our Lord Jesus Christ." Thus, the Apostle had shown, that justification, with all its blessed consequences, comes to us *by* and *through* our only Mediator Christ Jesus.—To this point he had conducted the discussion. Now a question arises, or an objector may be supposed to ask it, by way of cavil; How, or in what way, can ungodly sinners, without any meritorious doings of their own, obtain justification through the obedience of

another, even Jesus Christ? The Apostle answers, by referring to the case of sin and condemnation entering into the world by Adam. "Wherefore," as to the manner in which righteousness comes to us for justification by Jesus Christ, it is the same, "as by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned."

It will be perceived, that according to the present translation, a comparison is begun in this verse, which is left uncompleted.—For the other part of the comparison, termed the *reddition*, our Translators refer us to the 18th v. having marked the intervening words as a parenthesis. The ellipsis may, indeed, be supplied from that verse; but as that verse contains in itself a complete comparison of the same import, the intervening verses should not be regarded as parenthetical. On the contrary, they contain several distinct propositions, all bearing upon the general argument. It is no unusual thing in scripture, to have a comparison with only one side of the resemblance stated, especially when the other side is so obvious, that it cannot be mistaken. (See 1. Tim. i. 3.)—Hence the scope of the Apostle must be consulted in order to supply the ellipsis in this 12th verse. And by attending to what goes before and what follows, there is no difficulty in forming the true supplement;—which may be done as has already been stated—"Wherefore," justification comes to us by Christ, in the same manner, "as by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin," &c. Or the sentence may be completed thus—"as by one man sin entered," &c. *so* by one man, Jesus Christ, righteousness entered into the world, and life by righteousness, and so justification unto life passes upon all believers, for that they are all made righteous in Him. If this be the doctrine of the context, in relation to justification, the Apostle obviously designed, that the comparison should be completed in these or similar terms. And indeed the meaning would not be materially changed, if the verse were regarded as *expressing* a perfect comparison, and read thus—"Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, *even* so, or *so also*, death passed upon all men," &c.

By the "one man" here mentioned, Adam is unquestionably intended. It was by him that sin was introduced into the world of mankind. Death is here presented as the concomitant of sin; but it is stated in the 14th v., that "death reigned from Adam;" sin, therefore, must have commenced its

reign with Adam, and as he was the first of men, he must be the "one man," here intended, by whom sin entered into the world." Indeed every doubt in regard to the particular person here meant, is completely removed by the Apostle's declaration to the Corinthians, that "in Adam all die."

The term *sin* used in this verse, does not relate, so much, to sin in general, as to some particular sin, called emphatically, in the original, "the sin." All manner of sin did, indeed, enter in by the door of Adam; but the Apostle here refers to the *first sin*, that entered into the world; for, he adds, "and death by sin." Now it is evident, that death was threatened against the very first sin of Adam. Accordingly, when the Apostle asserts, that "by one man, sin entered into the world, and DEATH BY SIN," he manifestly speaks of the *first sin* of Adam, his first disobedience, his eating of the forbidden fruit. For by *that* act of transgression, it was, that *death* entered into the world.

The term *death*, in this place, is not to be considered as simply denoting "natural death." It is here put for the whole penalty threatened against transgression. It was said to Adam in relation to "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The *death* then threatened, is *that*, which the Apostle here declares to have entered "by sin." Now natural death forms but a very unimportant part of the divine penalty—the dissolution of the union between soul and body is hardly worthy of being mentioned, when compared with the full amount of evil embraced by the term *death*, as denounced against man's disobedience. The want of original righteousness, corruption of nature, loss of God's favor, loss of all communion with him, disability, misery, eternal torment, *these* are the bitter ingredients of that death, which was threatened, and which entered into the world "by one man's sin." By *death*, then, wherever found in this context, we are not to understand so much a *natural* as a *spiritual* death. It is the *penalty*, with which God has sanctioned his holy law, that is intended. This is evident from the contrast, which is repeatedly made in this passage, between *life* and *death*. If the *life* spoken of, signifies a *spiritual life*, then the *death*, to which it stands opposed, must signify a *spiritual death*. In the 17th v., the *death*, which reigns "by one man's offence," is contrasted with the *life*, which believers receive "by one, Jesus Christ." In the 18th

v., the *condemnation*, (to wit, *of death*) which comes "by the offence of one," is opposed to the *justification of life*, which comes as a free gift, "by the righteousness of one." The 21st v., presents the same contrast in the most striking manner—"That as sin hath reigned unto DEATH, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto ETERNAL LIFE, by Jesus Christ our Lord." And again in the next chapter at the 23rd v., similar language is employed—"The wages of sin is DEATH, but the gift of God is ETERNAL LIFE, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Now, it cannot reasonably be supposed, that the Apostle uses the word *death* in a more restricted, or less significant sense, in any part of this context, than he does in those just specified. Indeed when he tells us, that "by sin DEATH entered into the world," he must mean that DEATH which is "the wages of sin," and which is the very opposite of *that gift of God* which is "eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."

But notwithstanding, that the penalty, *death*, entered by the first sin of Adam, he was not its only subject; it did not *stop* with him; it "passed upon all men." And it *so* passed, as it entered. Death entered by the sin of one man, "and so (that is by the sin of one man) death passed upon all men." It *passed* (*παρέλαβεν*) through him to (*εἰς*) all men. This action is spoken of as already completed. It is not said, death *will pass*, but death *passed* upon all men. And if we enquire after the particular time when this happened, it was, when "by one man sin entered into the world." But as the penalty in its full extent, has not been actually endured by all men, some having been pardoned and saved, and millions of others being yet unborn, the meaning must be, that all became from that moment "dead in law," or that a *sentence* of death was then judicially passed upon all. But as this could not have taken place in justice, but upon the supposition, that all were involved in guilt, and thus rendered obnoxious to the penalty, the Apostle adds, "for that all have sinned." Here he assigns the reason, why "death passed upon all men." And it by no means affects the meaning of this clause, whether we rest in the present translation of it, or adopt the marginal reading, "in whom all have sinned." This latter is the more literal translation of the original, and was generally adopted by the ancient fathers, as also, by most of the Reformers. The only difference, however, between the two readings is, that while the one asserts in so many words, that all men sinned in Adam,

the other implies this by necessary inference. For if, in judicial procedure, sin must have precedence of the penalty, and if at some former period of time, death, the penalty of the divine law, passed upon all men, and as all men had not then sinned personally, not having, as yet, been brought into existence, it follows, that all must have sinned in Adam. The opponents of the doctrine of Original Sin prefer the common translation of this clause. The other, however, may justly be regarded as entitled to the preference. Because, of the two, it is the more easy and natural, especially, when it is considered, that the words, "and so," or "even so," require a repetition of the words, "by one man," to complete the sentence: and had this *implied* repetition been *expressed* by the Apostle, perhaps there never would have been any dispute respecting the true rendering of the clause in question. Let the ellipsis, then, be supplied, and the verse will unequivocally read as follows:—"Wherefore, AS BY ONE MAN sin entered into the world, and death by sin, AND so, (or EVEN so,) death passed upon all men, *by that one man, in whom all have sinned.*" And besides, this reading seems to express more forcibly the mind of the Apostle, as intended in the context; and surely we are bound to give to the language of any writer its greatest force in support of his declared sentiments. And why should the declaration, that "all mankind sinned in Adam," be pronounced more harsh and inconsistent than the following?—"IN Adam all die," 1 Cor. xv., 22.—"Levi paid tithes IN Abraham," Heb. vii. 9—"God hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places IN Christ Jesus," Eph. ii. 6. &c.

But is it a fact, that the *all men*, spoken of in this verse, includes the whole human family? The opponents of the doctrine of imputation will not allow, that the terms *all men* and *all* designate, in this place, all mankind universally. They restrict these terms to such as have *sinned actually*. But, we apprehend, that the Apostle's express design, in the next two verses, is to prove that all men, without any exceptions, sinned in Adam. Accordingly he fixes upon a period, when, if ever, such exceptions must have existed; viz: the period between Adam and Moses, when there was no external dispensation of the law. Now, it is an obvious dictate of reason, that *when there is no law, there can be no imputation of sin*; for sin must be imputed according to the rule of law. But let none maintain,

that Adam's breaking of the law of God annihilated it, until it was afterwards given by Moses, and that, consequently, during that period, there could be no sin imputed, there being no rule, according to which, it might, in justice, be imputed. For the Apostle plainly affirms the contrary. He says, v. 13. "For until the law, (that is, until it was given by Moses) sin was in the world." During all that period of more than twenty-five hundred years sin existed. Consequently there was also a law in existence, even the moral law, which Adam had violated: "For sin is not imputed when there is no law." But sin was imputed during that period; for, adds the Apostle, "nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses." v. 14. But if the penalty reigned, *sin*, the cause of it, must have existed, and also the law, according to which, the penalty was inflicted. Now the Apostle will admit of no exception, as to the extent of the penalty, during the period, which preceded the giving of the law at Mount Sinai. He declares, that "death reigned from Adam to Moses, EVEN OVER THEM THAT HAD NOT SINNED AFTER THE SIMILITUDE OF ADAM'S TRANSGRESSION." Infants, no doubt, are here characterised. For whom else can the Apostle mean? During the period specified, he intimates, that some had sinned "after the similitude of Adam's transgression," and others had not. This, his language evidently conveys. For in saying, that "death reigned *EVEN* over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression," he plainly intimates, that others *had so sinned*. By Adam's transgression, therefore, he cannot mean the simple act of his eating of the forbidden fruit; for none ever sinned, after the *similitude* of his transgression, in this way, by personally partaking of that fruit; but he means certain qualities of that act, which rendered it *a sinning actually* and *voluntarily* against God. And in this way, all his adult offspring sin after the *similitude* of his transgression—they sin *actually* and *voluntarily*. But the case is different with infants: they are incapable of sinning in this manner. They are, therefore, intended by the Apostle, by "them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression." And yet it is affirmed, that *death reigned even over them*. But, if they were made subjects of the penalty threatened against sin, the Righteous Judge must have regarded them as being chargeable with sin. And since they had committed no sin in their own persons, they must have committed it in a representative,

even in *him*, by whom sin and death entered into the world. Besides, it is not a mere natural death, that the Apostle speaks of, as thus reigning over infants, (though this would be sufficient to prove them sinners by Adam,) but, as has been before shown, *death*, the *penalty* of the divine law, *spiritual death* by way of eminence. This death reigned over every one of them, and none of them, though dying in infancy, could have escaped from its eternal reign and thralldom, but by the free and sovereign grace of God, which "reigns through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord."

At the close of the 14th v. Adam is called "the figure of him that was to come," that is, of Jesus Christ, who, from the beginning, was promised to come, as "the seed of the woman to bruise the head of the serpent;" and afterwards as "the seed of Abraham, in whom all the families of the earth should be blessed;" and who is represented in Ps. xl. as saying, "Lo, I come, &c." and whose praise is celebrated by the Church in Ps. cxviii, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Now in what sense is Adam called the "figure," *type*, or *emblematical representation* of our Lord Jesus Christ? It can only be, because he was the *head* and *representative* of his natural seed and acted in their room, even as our Lord Jesus Christ is the *head* and *representative* of his spiritual seed, and acts in their room. This is the only prominent point of resemblance, that can possibly be traced between them. And if this be not the Apostle's meaning, it would be a task, of endless conjecture to tell what he means. But, that this is his meaning, is evident from the whole scope of this passage, which exhibits these two distinguished personages, as acting in public representative characters—the disobedience of the one entailing sin and death upon all whom he represented, and the obedience of the other procuring righteousness and life for all whom he represented—and also from what this same Apostle declares to the Corinthians, "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Here then we have a full developement of the way, in which "death passed upon all men," *even upon infants*; it is, because they sinned in him, who was constituted, and acted the part of their federal head and representative; and who, in this grand particular, "was the figure of him that was to come."

But, although there be the most manifest and striking resemblance between Adam and Christ, in point of representative headship, each representing his respective seed feder-

ally and completely, yet, in point of *conduct* and the *effects* resulting from that conduct, the most awful contrast is to be marked. Verse 15. "But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead; much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many." The *conduct* of the one representative was a total failure in point of duty, "an offence," a *lapse*, a *fall*; that of the other, *righteousness*, which, from the free and gracious manner, in which it was performed, and from the free and gracious manner, in which it is conveyed to sinners, may well be called the "free gift," the "grace of God," and the "gift by grace." And as to the *effects* resulting from the public conduct of these representatives, they are infinitely different. The conduct of the one resulted in *death*, that of the other in *life*. Yea, such is the goodness of God, and such the superiority of Christ to Adam in respect of personal dignity, that his righteousness avails more abundantly for the justification of his seed, than does the offence of Adam for the condemnation of his seed. "For if through the offence of one many be dead; much more the grace of God," &c. It may be farther remarked on this verse, that the Apostle makes the sin of Adam to be the sin of his posterity. For he says, "through the offence of one many are dead," spiritually dead, deprived of the favor of God, destitute of righteousness, full of corruption, without God, without hope in the world. They are thus dead by the *offence of one*, viz: Adam. And they that are thus dead are called *many*, not to the exclusion of any of the human family; for it is afterwards asserted, that, "by the offence of one, judgement came upon all men to condemnation," but they are called *many* for the purpose of keeping up the parallel between them and the *many*, who live by Jesus Christ.

In the 16th verse, the Apostle continues to pursue the contrast between the public acts of Adam and Christ, in relation to their consequences. "And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification." The term "judgment," denotes a judicial sentence, proceeding upon the assumption of legal guilt, and the term "condemnation" denotes the condition of a criminal, after sentence is pronounced against him, and by which he is declared to be guilty, and stands adjudicated to undergo the merited punish-

ment. Now it is here asserted, that "the judgment to condemnation," spoken of, arose from "one" offence. We have no concern in any of the sins of Adam, save his "one offence." And that "one offence," the Righteous Judge viewed as the legal guilt of all men, and accordingly, as is here implied, and as is expressly stated in the 18th v. he issued a judicial sentence involving the condemnation of all. But, although the "one offence" of Adam was thus efficacious for the ruin of all men, still in respect of intrinsic efficiency, it falls short of the gift of righteousness by Jesus Christ. For his obedience abundantly avails, not merely to justification, but to the justification of condemned sinners, and not to their justification from the "one offence" of their representative, only, but to their justification from their many personal offences, also. "The free gift is of MANY OFFENCES unto justification."

In the 17th verse the Apostle contrasts the *death*, which came by the sin of Adam, with the *life*, which is enjoyed through the righteousness of Christ; and, in the way of magnifying the work of the second Adam, he concludes, that, however certain it be, that death reigned by the first Adam, yet there is, if possible, a greater certainty, that all, who receive the grace of God and embrace the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by Jesus Christ. What a most glorious and dignified personage, therefore, is Jesus Christ! How infinitely meritorious has been his conduct as our representative! Why should any speak against his righteousness, as being vicarious? And why should any refuse to appropriate it as their own righteousness? Since it is in this way, and in this way alone, that we can, with the assurance of absolute certainty, escape death and reap everlasting life. "For, if by one man's offence death reigned by one; MUCH MORE they who receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ."

The 18th verse is a general inference, embodying the substance of all that had been proved in the foregoing verses; and in making it, the Apostle, at the same time, observes the comparative method which he had before adopted. "Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." The reader will observe, that the words, *judgment came*, in the former clause, are a supplement borrowed from the 16th verse. Between an

offence and a state of condemnation, on account of that offence, there necessarily intervenes a *judgment*, or judicial sentence founded on law; hence this supplement is natural and is obviously implied in the Apostle's argument. This must be borne in mind; because, some of the opponents of imputation are ready to admit, that, if the term "judgment" had been here *expressed* by the Apostle, and if by the term *condemnation*, which he uses, he mean any thing more than natural death, then the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin, is established. This, indeed, is honest; but to the force of truth are we indebted for the concession. For a child may know, if the condemnation, here mentioned, imply an adjudication to suffer the *whole penalty* of the divine law, and this condemnation extend to all men, and that by a judicial sentence, grounded upon the "one offence" of Adam, that, then, all must have been held guilty in Adam. But can any one seriously doubt that the term "condemnation," expressed in this verse, relates to *death*, the penalty of the law, even to spiritual and eternal, as well as to temporal death? How unreasonable such a doubt, since that term stands directly opposed to "justification of life!" For surely no person will maintain, that this "justification of life" signifies an exemption from natural death! Candor must admit, that it implies spiritual and eternal life, even such a life as is consequent upon justification before God. And when we also consider, that the supplying of the ellipsis, by the word "judgment," is, as we have seen, indispensably necessary, it follows, in spite of all opposition and cavil, that Adam's offence is charged as the guilty cause of the spiritual condemnation of all.—The words, "the free gift came" in the latter clause of the verse, are also for the same reasons, properly supplied, by our Translators, from the 16th verse. It must not, however, from the language here employed, be supposed, that "justification" by Christ, is co-extensive with "condemnation" by Adam. This would glaringly contradict what is elsewhere taught us, concerning the everlasting destruction of all, "who know not God and who obey not the gospel." The "all men," therefore, in both clauses, does not denote identically the same persons, but only the whole number which each of those great federal heads, who are contrasted throughout the whole of this passage, respectively represented. By the offence of the *one*, "judgment came" upon all his representees to "condemnation;"

and by the righteousness of the *other*, "the free gift came" upon all his representees to "justification of life."

The 19th verse explains more fully the reason of the divine procedure, mentioned in the 18th. If it be asked, why were all men subjected to a state of condemnation, on account of the offence of one man? We are here furnished with the answer, viz: that "by one man's disobedience they WERE MADE SINNERS," constituted sinners, considered as being guilty of that disobedience. Hence they were condemned, not as innocent creatures, but as being *sinner*s, chargeable in the sight of heaven with the guilt of their representative. And so on the other hand, if it be asked, how are those, who are guilty and condemned sinners, put in possession of that incomparable privilege, "justification unto life?" The answer is, that such, "by the obedience of one," Jesus Christ, are MADE RIGHTEOUS, constituted righteous, treated as righteous. Hence they are justified, not as guilty creatures, but as being righteous, legally righteous, through the righteousness of their representative imputed to them. In respect, then, of God's procedure relative to the condemnation and justification of men, the Apostle's declaration, in this verse, is not only plain but highly instructive. "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."

The foregoing explanatory remarks, it is believed, exhibit the true mind of the Spirit in this confessedly important, though much perverted scripture, and will be helpful in the further prosecution of the subject.

(To be Continued.)

[For the Religious Monitor.]

REASONS ASSIGNED FOR FASTING ON THE
OCCASION OF THE DREADFUL PLAGUE
THE CHOLERA, OR, THE SINS OF OUR
TIMES.

[Concluded from page 335.]

IT was my endeavour to draw before the reader a correct statement of our sins, that we might fast aright on the occasion of this Cholera. And I promised to suggest a few things respecting Fasting itself. Perhaps some will consider them too late. The Cholera has now subsided through the country. Society has resumed its wonted gaiety and sprightliness. Business has returned to its full tide. And all things are as they were. Well, and has the cause of quarrel between

you and God been removed, and the whole matter settled on a solid footing? If so, I may indeed be too late. Yet there is some ground to presume that *wrong* had gone on too far and too long, to be righted all of a sudden, and that they who think it is now *all over* have not *yet begun*, nor looked into the true state of the case at all. There is reason to fear that many who have been so expeditious as to have it *all over* already, have been but white-washing the tomb, and that their last state is incomparably worse than their first. I will therefore proceed with my suggestions on the duty.

In fasting it is essentially necessary that the heart be *rightly* affected with sin; and in order to this it ought to be placed before us, and therefore we ought to use the proper means to accomplish this. The Psalmist, in fasting, said, "my sin is ever before me."

The preceding part of this paper was designed to aid in this particular, but not to supersede the necessity of every man "searching and trying his own ways," by the word of God. Unless each one for himself, conscientiously endeavour to bring his heart and life, in every station, and relation, which he fills, so far as it can be brought within the scope of vision, to the test, his joining with the multitude in the observance of a public fast, is but a wicked daring, to mock the searcher of hearts, and provoke him to give us over to a reprobate mind. If this has been the manner of our late fasts, we have as much need to fast for them, as for any thing previous to them. To spend a small portion of a day in hearing a public discourse on the duty, or grounds of fasting, and the rest of it in our customary courses of sin and vanity, or in making up the *lost time*, is an impiety from which every religious soul must recoil with horror.

We may be *truly* affected with sin, under several notions of it, that are all founded in truth, and yet not be *rightly* affected by it at all.

Sin, doubtless, has brought this Cholera, and disease, and death, in every form in which they appear among the human race. It has thrown the will and affections into a state of insubordination to the understanding, which has produced anarchy, bloodshed, and misery in every form. It has brought guilt upon the conscience, and a tormenting apprehension of divine indignation. It fills us with shame, and covers us with disgrace; and we may be truly affected by it, even to sorrow and lamentation, in each of these views of it. Yet this is nothing more, for

ought I can see, than what the damned spirits may, and do feel; and, therefore, can be no criterion of christian exercise.

The *right* effect can be produced on our hearts, only by that view of it, in which it appears *against God*. This was that which affected the holy Psalmist more than any thing else. "Against thee, thee *only*, have I sinned." Ps. li. And all sin is the same in this respect. It strikes against his being at once, and says, "There is no God." Ps. xiv. It denies him to be omniscient, for it says, "God doth not see, nor God of Jacob know." It is "enmity against God," against his wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth—against a trinity of persons in the unity of essence—against Christ the Son of God—God in human nature—against the law of God—against the grace of God—against all the works of God together. It is an abomination to Him who is infinitely lovely in himself. It is treachery to him who is infinitely faithful. It is the blackest ingratitude, to the most beneficent friend. But words fail to say *what it is*. Hell itself will never be able to develope all its deformity. If you would wish to see it in full, and bold relief, look to the top of Calvary, and behold the Eternal Son, suffering in the flesh, at the hand of that Father, who bore infinite love to him at that very moment. It was for the sins of his chosen *imputed* to him. Such an injury done to a fellow worm, would fill an ingenuous mind with shame and contrition, and if it produce not this effect, when done to the dread Sovereign and Judge of all the earth, we must be much nearer to the casting off all profession of religion, and the avowal of infidelity, than any one suspects, and our fasting is but a fearful beguiling of our souls into everlasting perdition.

We ought to beware, in fasting, of a *legal temper of mind*, which is ready to take advantage of all duties to turn them to some account before God, in our view, as though our fasting were a satisfaction to him for our sins, or, at least, gave us a ground of hope before him, or made us better than others who have not fasted. If by fasting, we shall fall into any of these notions, our last state is worse than our first. Such fasting, God will not regard, and it leaves us stout-hearted, and far from righteousness. However truly and properly we fast, we can be no profit to the Almighty, nor can it lay Him under any obligations. In itself considered, fasting is no more than what sinners are bound to, by the Moral Law, and the doing of it, entitles them to nothing.

VOL. IX.

And if any suppose, that these numerous Fasts that have been observed through the land, give them a *right* to the subsiding of the Cholera, or of any other Divine Judgement, it is very probable, that they will yet have to say, "wherefore have we Fasted, and thou seest not? Wherefore have we afflicted our soul, and thou takest no knowledge?" Isa. lviii. 3.

On the other hand, we ought to take heed of going to the opposite extreme,—of viewing our sins as a ground for despair. However great and manifold they are, "there is forgiveness with God," Ps. cxxx. equal to their demerit. There is merit in the blood of Christ, to atone for, and virtue to cleanse from *all sin*. And unless in fasting, we take hold of this blood as held out to us in the absolutely free offer of the Gospel, it will be essentially defective, and therefore unacceptable before the throne. God has never called any one to despair wherever the Gospel is published, since it was first made known in the world. Viewing the absolute perfection of Christ's Righteousness, and the absolute unconditionality of the offer of it *to all—to us*, let us roll over upon it, the burden of all our sins.

We ought also to remember, that Fasting, unaccompanied by a sincere purpose of amendment through Divine aid, is a hollow deception, and will prepare for going a farther length in wickedness, than we have yet done. And that no purpose of amendment can be sincere, unless it be to retrace *ALL* our wrong steps, and go back to the very beginning of our defection from God and his truth, and make entire and thorough Reformation. Here there is much, very much, to do. And I fear it will not be done. And yet, without it, our fasting is only another step to sure destruction. It will not do the work, to lop off a few of the topmost twigs. If we mean to be honest with the searcher of hearts, and not to sport with his anger, we will strike the root—our *disaffection* to a free salvation, emanating from absolute sovereignty; in other words, those truths of the Bible, commonly called the principles of the Reformation, the sum of which is contained in the Westminster Confession; and go back to *first love*, and do our first work. We will thence proceed to cleanse the House of the Lord, of all the abominable doctrines and practices which spiritual idolaters have set up there, and restore his ordinances as at the first. We will "cut down the groves, and break in pieces the images, and slay the priests with the sword of the *Spirit*, which is the word

of God, and make a clean riddance of anti-scriptural, anti-christian worship out of the land. And we "will return unto the Lord with weeping and supplication," and particularly that he would forgive the oft repeated and long continued violation of *solemn covenant engagements*. We ought particularly to be ashamed because of our looking to human aid, and an arm of flesh, when we began to suspect ourselves to be in an evil case. I mean that host of contrivances, uncalled for, and unwarranted by the word of God, which have been brought to help Zion out of her strait—unions of churches based on some compromise of truth; societies, missionary boards, revivals, and what else of the same kind, originates from a fictitious charity.

All these are physicians of no value. There is no balm in them that can heal the hurt of the daughter of Zion. I might apply to them the argument of the apostle, to prove the insufficiency of the typical sacrifices of old, to take away sin, viz: the necessity of offering them from year to year continually. For if these human plans could effectually revive and restore true and undefiled religion, as at the first, there would be no necessity of that frequent recurrence to them, which we see takes place. Truly we CAN destroy ourselves, but in *God only* is our help. And since he has all this time been waiting to be gracious, we ought to be ashamed of all these vain and proud self-righteous endeavours, to obtain help from another quarter. From public, we ought to proceed to private, family reformation, and from that to personal. And it would require a great overturning of popular principles, and fashionable practices, yea, a revolution effecting the whole course of life, of which there is no sign, or prospect at present. But it WILL come in the time appointed, and that time is comparatively not far off. Without such a reformation, we can not believe that God's controversy with us is settled; "his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still," and we will still "go on frowardly," and "walk still more contrary unto him," and other and heavier judgments will fall upon us, until the time he has set to favour Zion, by remembering her with the most undeserved mercy, in the midst of deserved wrath and destruction.

Such reformation is only our duty, yet we ought to bear in memory that we are as insufficient for it, as the debtor is to pay his debts, after his property and money is all expended. We want the heart and the principle, and in our fasts, and reformations,

"nothing will come up but briars and thorns, until the Spirit be poured out from on high. While, therefore, a sense of the duty presses upon the conscience, a sense of our own weakness ought to impel us to go to the throne of grace for strength.

Our fasts ought to be accompanied with *thankfulness* for mercies still continued. "It is of his mercies, that we are not consumed." The greater part of the country has yet been exempt from this Cholera. He might have sent it with more severity, where it has come. He might have made his stroke to fall on all our substance; and removed all his restraints from our corrupt propensities, and given us over to a reprobate mind. There are still many privileges to be enjoyed in civil community. There is still a true church on the earth. The true doctrine and ordinances of the gospel are still preserved. There is yet made a free and unconditional offer of Christ, and eternal salvation, to the chief of sinners. He is beseeching us to accept, and waiting to be gracious, because he delights in mercy. He is not dealing with us as we have sinned, nor requiring our ill.

We have an High Priest that can be touched with a fellow-feeling, for our infirmities, being in all points tempted like as we are. He has passed into the heavens, to make intercession for us, and he is able to save to the very uttermost, seeing he ever lives to make intercession. We have the whole counsel of God revealed to us in the scriptures, in which are all the purposes of his love, and promises of his mercy, ratified by the blood of the cross—of easy access to the meanest and poorest in the land. "What shall we render unto the Lord for all these benefits?" We have nothing to render that is not his already, and surely it will be so much the more ungrateful, if we neglect to make even an acknowledgement to him of all these mercies. If we are not fully sensible of the number and value of continued mercy, neither are we rightly affected with our sins, for both go together.

In our fasts we ought to have many things to *ask* of God; in particular, that he would stay his judgments—but still more that he would, by his sanctifying grace, remove from our heart, and life, the procuring cause of them; that he would open the eyes of the religious community, on the deceits and delusions practised upon them, and visit the churches with the real effusions of his Holy Spirit, and cause a genuine revival of love to the whole truth, which is the only means of a holy heart, and life; that he

would raise up men that will be valiant for the truth, and thereby for the souls of perishing sinners, who, regarding neither fear, nor favour, will most faithfully, and boldly, yet humbly, and with much diffidence in themselves, declare the whole truth; and that he would deliver the churches from the "wolves in sheep's clothing," that have got into all denominations, who, under a variety of hypocritical pretences, are seeking a popular name, a large salary, and an easy life.

[For the Religious Monitor.]

ON DIVINE LOVE.

CONTEMPLATION II.—On the love of the Father, displayed in giving his Son to be the Saviour of his people, illustrated from 1 John iv 10. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins."

PREAMBLE.

The Psalmist, David, said, "delight thyself in God." To this we have the greatest encouragement: for the Apostle John declares "that God is love." He is so in a very distinguishing manner to fallen men. Thus he proclaimed his name to Moses: "The Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering, abundant in goodness and truth. Keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty." The meaning is, there will be a full revenge taken upon the guilt, and a glorious display of mercy to the sinner.

We have contemplated the mutual love of the Father and the Son in laying, and in accomplishing the plan of our salvation. But as Divine Love is a subject so excellent, and delightful, it may be proper to contemplate it as in the *fountain* from which it flows, and that is God himself: and in the *streams* in which it runs, as displayed, *distinctly*, and *harmoniously*, by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

We shall begin with the love of the Father, as expressed by the Apostle John, "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins."—But, as so many errors abound at present, which raze the foundation of the whole gospel, it is necessary to make a few preliminary observations, concerning redeeming love in general.

PART I.

As *deism* so much abounds, we begin by

observing, 1st. That redeeming love is a subject which can be known only by divine revelation. Though "God hath not left himself without witness, in that he did good, giving us rain, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with gladness," we could never have obtained the knowledge of redeeming love, if he had not given us the Bible. So true is that great remark, that extends itself over all the parts of our religion, "Eye has not seen it." No sense can discover it. "Ear has not heard it." No report can declare it. Nay, no imagination is able to frame and mould it—it cannot so much as "enter into the hearts of men." But "God reveals them to us by *HIS Spirit*." He reveals other things by our spirits, as his eternal power and Godhead, in the works of Creation. "There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty gives him understanding." And thus, "the invisible things of God, what may be known of him, are manifested to us, for he has revealed it in us." But in the matter of redeeming love, he communicates himself in a higher way: he reveals them to us "by *his own Spirit*;" whose inquiries are like himself, equal to a nature that "searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." And he alone is capable of doing it: for, "what man knows the things of a man, save the spirit of man that is in him? Even so, the things of God knows no man, but the Spirit of God." It is from him we have the doctrine of redeeming love.

Suppose we could argue from God's goodness to his creatures below, that he has creatures above, whom he feeds and fills with his love, such a *place* must be for *pure* spirits, and such a *portion* for *holy* ones. But, what is that to us, who live in a world of sin, and houses of clay: the Bible alone reveals salvation to the chief of sinners.

And then, who could have contrived the *manner*? "That in order to man's going up into Heaven, God should come down upon earth." That "the word should be made flesh, and dwell among us." "That the just should die for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." If these were to be the terms of our salvation, what angel, what man could have contrived, or durst have proposed them? The Bible alone reveals these unaccountable doctrines, that Christ should "appear in the last days, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." That by "*his own* death, he was to subdue him that had the power of death, that is the devil." "That he should be made sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be

made the righteousness of God in him." That God, who loves the righteous, and hates the wicked, should be pleased "to bruise one who had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth." These are all absurdities to the reason of man. No learning will bow to them, till the Spirit of God takes "the weapons of our warfare" into his own hand. Then "imagination" (reasonings) "are cast down, and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God." Lay aside the evidence of divine revelation, these doctrines are so far from being true, that they are ridiculous. "Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" For, "after the world in wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." To make human reason, which the Apostle calls, "the natural man," &c., a dark corrupt faculty, the judge of divine revelation, is more absurd, than to try the light of the meridian sun by the smallest taper sunk in the socket. "There is a ball of light rolling over this world; but what it is, the force of its heat, and the strength of its beams, are things we dare not try." Much more so is it here. Thus saith the Psalmist, "O Lord my God, thou art very great: thou art clothed with honor and majesty. Who coverest thyself with light as with a garment." If God's nature could be comprehended, and his decrees explained, he would not be equal to our adoration. When the Psalmist saith, "he sent redemption to his people: he hath commanded his covenant forever," his inference is an adoration, "Holy and reverend is his name." "Who can by searching find out God? Who can find out the Almighty to perfection?" The critics tell us, that the word rendered *perfection* signifies the parts or *secrets* about the heart. As God's wisdom can receive no error, and his truth can publish none, so we have nothing higher by which to try his testimony. Among men, the character of the witness depends upon the testimony. If a person declare a true thing, we believe him to be a true witness. But here, the truth of the testimony depends upon the character of the witness. "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." He is also, "a God of truth and without iniquity," (falsehood.) Thus he saith himself. "Hear; for I will speak of excellent things: and the opening of my mouth shall be right things. For my mouth shall speak truth: and wickedness is an abomination to my

lips. All the words of my mouth are in righteousness; there is nothing froward or perverse in them."

"Shall human reason, which is dunced in things within its own sphere, pretend to sit as a judge upon a revelation which comes from the bosom of God, to be the eternal admiration of angels and men.?"* What can the *deists* say to these things? "Let God be true, but every man a liar: as it is written, that thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged."

2. Redeeming love resides in, and flows from, *One Being*, and that is God himself, the great infinite One. The heathens had "gods many, and lords many," to whom they made supplication for different favours. "But to us there is but one God," who is the *sole* author of all the bounties of providence, and all the blessings of salvation. Thus saith the church, "blessed be the Lord, who daily loadeth us with benefits, even the God of our salvation, Selah. He that is our God, is the God of salvation, and unto God the Lord belong the issues from death"—It will do the *deists* no harm, to present them with the opinions of the most learned of the Gentile nations.—Let us begin with the wisdom of Egypt. "If we believe Macrobius, there was no people in the world could vie for learning with the Egyptians, who makes Egypt in one place, 'the mother of all arts,' and in another, the 'father of all philosophical sciences.'† The wisdom of Solomon is set forth with this character, "That it exceeded the wisdom of all the children of the East country, and all the wisdom of Egypt." And Stephen, by the Holy Ghost said, that "Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. And yet there was no nation more sunk in gross idolatry. Though they considered a sheep as an abomination, (Exod. viii. 26.) they worshiped every other animal, and vegetable, and even the Nile itself: because they thought that God was in every creature, that he made. But God condemned their idolatry. Thus he said to Moses, "Against all the gods of Egypt, I will execute judgment: I am the Lord." And saith the Prophet Isaiah, "The burden of Egypt. Behold the Lord rideth upon a swift cloud, and shall come into Egypt: and the idols of Egypt shall be moved at his presence, and the heart of Egypt shall melt in the midst of it."

The Chaldeans are next in order. They

* Alexander Moncrief.

† Stillingfleet. *Origines sacre*, p. 122.

also excelled in learning, particularly in astronomy. But their's was a land of graven images. Nebuchadnezzar had a treasure-house for his god. But God poured contempt upon their idols. "BEL boweth down, Nebo stoopeth, their idols were upon the beasts, and upon the cattle: your carriages were heavy laden; they were a burden to the weary beast. They stoop, they bow down together; they could not deliver the burden, but themselves are gone into captivity." Again, Babylon is taken. Bel is confounded, Merodach is broken in pieces: her idols are confounded, her images are broken in pieces."

The Grecians distinguished themselves by their polite researches. But they thought "the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device." Nay, at *Athens*, the seat of philosophy, and the fine arts, they had an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. In fine,

Though we read of the virtue of the ancient Romans, yet even, in what is called *the golden age*, Cicero himself, wrote a book "*De natura Deorum*:" i. e. concerning the nature of the gods. Thus, "All people walked every one in the name of his god."

What can the most *learned* and *candid* deists say to these incontestable facts? Will they prefer a Voltaire, a Volney, a Bolingbroke, a Shaftsbury, a Hume, and lastly a poor profane Paine, to all the wisdom of Egypt, the learning of the Chaldeans, and all the philosophers in Greece, and Rome!—Thus, though people can *now* delineate the religion of nature with a Bible in their hand, they who had it not, never knew the true God, nor worshipped him as *one*.—The unity of the Godhead, was ever the grand article of revealed religion, the Jews had it placed in the front of their law. When the Scribe asked Christ; which was the first commandment of all, he answered, "The first of all the commandments is this, hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord." And as the Jews threw off their idolatry, with their last captivity, "the Scribe himself said to him, well, Master, thou hast said the truth, for there is one God, and there is no other but he." Nor does our Saviour contradict him, but owns that he answered discreetly. When the Gentiles turned from idols, it was to serve the living and true God—Thus, God is often mentioned in the Unity of his nature. It is said, "Thou art God, even thou *alone*," i. e. there is a meaning of the word, that is only thine. So again, "Thou whose name *alone* is Je-

hovah." There is but one Almighty. It is the attribute not of a person, but a nature, to distinguish it from all that is derived and limited. We press this with fervency, and firmness, in opposition to those *unreasonable men*, who, because we believe the doctrine of the trinity, affirm that we maintain that there are three Gods, while we always declare, that there is no more than *one*. The Scriptures, which are the rule of *our faith*, declare as fully, and plainly against three Gods, as against three thousand. In speaking of one God, according to the language of revelation, all other *deities* are struck off. "*Among the gods*, there is *none* like unto thee, O Lord, neither are there any works like to thy works." Nay, they are struck out of the comparison, "thou art great and dost wonderful works, *thou art God alone*."—This *one God* is the fountain of all the divine love, which flows so abundantly in the salvation of the church. "How great is his goodness, how great is his beauty!"

3. Though the scriptures reveal the most high God as no more than one, yet they declare that he exists with a *distinction*, neither greater nor less than that of three persons. We are plainly told that "there are *three*, that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and that these three are but *one*." If any dispute the authority of this text, we have the truth in others, and we have it more abundantly. Our Saviour commissioned the disciples to "baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The benediction of the Apostle is originally, and properly a supplication. "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of *God*, and the communion of the *Holy Ghost*." The Message to the Seven Churches of *Asia*, begins with "grace and peace, from him which is, was, and is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before his throne, and from Jesus Christ." So, "you are elect according to the foreknowledge of *God the father*, through sanctification of *the Spirit*, and the sprinkling of the blood of *Jesus*." "Whether we are baptized or blessed, it is into the name of *three*. The number is never enlarged, and never diminished. If the scripture had not designed we should have spoken of so many in our professions and adorations, we should never have had their names. But it is plain, that though our surrender in baptism, is to the only living and true God, yet we cannot leave out any single person in the trinity."*

* Bradbury.

4. Divine love is displayed by each person in the Godhead, as if he were the *sole* author of our salvation, because he is *God*. "Blessed be the *God*, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings, in heavenly things in Christ. And yet Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it. And he was "*God* who purchased the church with his own blood." In fine, saith the Apostle, "ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the *Spirit of our God*." Now "it is *God* who sanctifies." And believers are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Lord." (If it had been expressed in the language of the Old Testament, it would have been *Jehovah*.) "the Spirit."—It is a saying generally admitted "that all the external works of God are common to the whole Trinity."—Gregory Nazianzen saith, "the one name common to three, is the deity." Hence Austin gives it as a rule in speaking of the Holy Trinity: When one person of the three is named in any work, the whole Trinity is to be understood to affect it, as I read in Dr. Owen. This doctrine is very plainly and curiously expressed in our Shorter Catechism. "There are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory." We observe,

5. That Divine Love is displayed in our salvation, by all the persons in the Godhead, in a manner *peculiar* to each, that is in a *personal* way.—Indeed there are many acts of love which are attributed, in promiscuous language, to every one of them, as has been observed in general, in the preceding particular, which we may here unfold with a little enlargement: our spiritual life, and light; our pardon and acceptance; our sanctification, perseverance, resurrection from the dead; our admittance into heaven, and our entertainment there, each of these is sometimes ascribed to the Father, sometimes to the Son, and all of them to the Holy Ghost, which proves an equality of nature. But there are others, that we never read of, but as personal actions. Thus,

"In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him. Herein is love not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." Once more. "We have seen and do testify, that the *Father* sent the Son to be the

Saviour of the world."—The Son displayed his love in many things, peculiar to himself, which are never ascribed to the Father, or the Spirit. He alone assumed the human nature. He took not on him, (he did not lay hold on, or engage for) "the nature of angels: but he took on him," (engaged for) the seed of Abraham. "For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same." Divinity in the person of the Son alone assumed the human nature. He alone was *made of a woman* made under the law." He is that eternal life who was *with the Father*, and was manifested to us, was looked upon and handled. He alone "was made a curse for us; and did by *himself* purge our sins." "He is the *first begotten from the dead*." He is our advocate with the Father, and *will, in person*, judge the world.

The Spirit is said, to move holy men of God, before Christ came, and to make apostles and overseers of the churches afterwards. He formed and purified the human nature of Christ, and anointed him to preach the gospel. He dwells in believers, their bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost. He is the earnest in their hearts, and sealeth them. Dr. Owen observes, it is not any *work*, or *attestation* of the Spirit. The *Spirit himself* is the seal. "Ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise."

7. Though the persons in the Trinity, act *distinctly*, and each one in a manner *peculiar* to himself, they do not, they cannot act *separately*, or the one as the *agent* and *instrument* of the other, and the reason is, that the divine nature, which is the principle of all divine operations, is possessed *equally* by them all. So that whatever person performs any work, it is the work of the only living and true God. This will appear, by reviewing the particulars mentioned, in the preceding observation.

1st. It was the Father who sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world, and this can be no other than the work of God. "When the fullness of time was come, *God* sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law." "Blessed be the *Lord God of Israel*, who has visited and redeemed his people, and raised up a horn of salvation." The disciples said "we believe that thou camest forth *from God*."

2d. The Son did many things, that are peculiar to his person. He alone was a child born, a sacrifice for sin, and the first begotten from the dead. And though these descriptions belong to the *human* nature, yet

the redemption that he fulfilled by them, will prove the *divine*. He who was of the seed of *David* according to the flesh, must be over all, *God blessed forever*. None but a God could be incarnate: so as to redeem them that are under the law, that they might receive the adoption of sons. Had an angel been made a partaker of flesh and blood, he might have lived and died, but he could never have *reconciled us to God*. His blood would not have been able, to do away one sin. He could not have trod the wine-press. Christ did that *alone*. And therefore the seed of the woman, was no other than *God manifest in the flesh*.

8d. The Holy Spirit has things said of him, which are not attributed either to the Father or Son, in a personal way. Such as furnishing out prophets, apostles, pastors and Teachers: sanctifying, comforting and securing believers. And all these suppose, and declare a divine nature. The Scriptures of the prophets were given by *inspiration of God*. And yet, holy men of God spake as they were *moved by the Holy Ghost*. The apostles had a greater unction, from *the Holy One*, than any ever received before, or I believe shall do again, and it was by the *Holy Ghost's* coming down upon them, that they were endowed with power from on high. It is *God alone* who would give *pastors*, after his own heart, to feed us with knowledge and understanding. This is no other than the Holy Ghost who made them *overseers*. God put words into Aaron's mouth, and the disciples spake as *the Spirit* gave them utterance. He that is born of *the Spirit* is born of *God*. He is the *Comforter*; and yet it is *God* who comforts them that are cast down. You are the temples of the *Holy Ghost*: that is, *God dwells* in you. By this relation to the third person of the Holy Trinity, you are called the temple of the *living God*. Your perseverance is owing to the Spirit, who shall guide and lead you into the land of uprightness. This is no other than *God's* guiding you by *his counsel*, and receiving you up to *his glory*.—The particulars in this, and the preceding observation, are borrowed from Bradbury's sermons on Baptism, which the reader may consult at large.

8. *Lastly*. All the persons in the God-head *concur* with each other, acting *jointly* and *harmoniously* in all the displays of their love, in our salvation. We have contemplated the unity of counsel, and harmony of love, between the Father and the Son, in laying and in accomplishing the plan of our salvation, and we will explain it more fully

when we contemplate the love of the Son, *distinctly*, by itself. We will also shew the harmony of the love of the Spirit, both with the Father and the Son, when we contemplate *his* love, displayed in our salvation, both towards the person of Christ, and his people. We shall conclude, at present, by observing in general, that as the Father appointed, qualified, and sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world: So the Son appealed to his Father at last. "I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do." And as the Father and the Son send the Spirit, so he also will finish his work, by leading the saints to the land of uprightness.—It was judged necessary to illustrate and confirm the preceeding observations. For without some knowledge of the distinct and harmonious operations of the persons in the Godhead, it seems impossible to take one right step in the first and fundamental duty, in all religion, and that is *prayer*. This is plainly laid before us by the Apostle. "Through him," (i. e. Christ Jesus), "we, both Jews and Gentiles, have access by one Spirit unto the Father."

(To be Continued.)

PSALMODY.

To the Editor of the *Orthodox Presbyterian*, (Ireland.).

SIR,—Having seen in *The Orthodox Presbyterian*, some months ago, a very interesting history of the several different versions of the Psalms, I hoped the writer would have gone farther, and said something about the practical use of those inspired songs. What avails knowledge about any subject connected with religion, if it is not accompanied by practice? I would wish, therefore, through the medium of your publication, to call the attention of Christians to this subject, and suggest a few things, as answers to objections made to the Psalms, both by Presbyterians and Independents.

It is admitted by all whom we call Orthodox, that the very object for which the Psalms were intended by the Spirit of God was, that they should be used in his own service. But the great objection to them is, "they were made for Old Testament times, and are not suited to New Testament worship." This objection is altogether unfounded in whatever way we view it. In the first place, it is unscriptural to make any such distinction as this objection implies, between the Old and New Testament. Are they not both the same revela-

tion of grace and mercy to man? What would the New Testament be without the Old? A new religion altogether, without support or foundation. The New Testament gives further light indeed; but is it not the same sun that pours forth the first dawn in the morning, and shines more and more unto the perfect day? I have heard the Old Testament very appropriately compared to a shining lamp, and the New Testament to a reflector that increases its brilliancy. If we look into the lives and conversation of believers under the old dispensation, we shall find them not inferior to those under the New Testament. Although they had not the Gospel so fully revealed as we have, yet this want was made up to them by the abundant communication of the Holy Spirit. Job's words are as plain and as strong as any of the apostles could have used. Job xix. verse 20, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and my eyes shall behold, and not another, though my reins be consumed within me." Is not this the very language of the New Testament—"God manifested in the flesh," which points out the "self-same Spirit," revealing the one Gospel from the first promise made to Adam, to the last "Amen, even so, come Lord Jesus?" But again, where can we find, even in the New Testament, any thing breathing more of spirituality, heavenly mindedness, and devotedness to God, than most of the Psalms? Where, even in the New Testament, are the pollution of man by sin, the necessity of regeneration, of sanctification of heart, and uprightness of conduct, before he can approach to God, more clearly expressed?

No composition of man can, for one moment, be compared with the Psalms, there are so many grand ideas contained in them in a few words; some of them describing the glory and the extent of the Redeemer's kingdom; others the glory of his person; others describing the character and conduct of a believer; others again detailing the providences of God to nations in general, and to his own people in particular. There are also a great many prophetic Psalms, some of them already fulfilled, some of them referring to a day yet future. Our Lord speaks of how many things were written in the Psalms, concerning himself; the apostles show how highly they valued the book of Psalms, by their quoting so often from it.

In fact, there is no part of Old Testament Scripture so often cited into the New Testament, and it is worthy of particular remark, that the first chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews, whose object is to set forth the dignity of the Redeemer's character and office, is nearly all taken from this very book of Psalms. There is a strange inconsistency and contradiction among Christians of the present day upon this subject. Some who think themselves nearest the truth, who profess a strict and literal adherence to the Scriptures, and boast that they have laid aside the works of men in every thing connected with religion, have yet in this most solemn part of religious worship allowed the works of men to be introduced along with these divinely inspired songs,—if, indeed, they have not altogether excluded the latter.

Another objection is, that some of the Psalms are cruel and vindictive. Some of them, indeed, Hezekiah-like, bring the profane words of the wicked, spoken against God and his people, and spread them out before the Lord, praying over them, that he would vindicate his own cause in his own time; and others proclaim deserved punishment upon the workers of iniquity. But other parts of Scripture may be rejected for the same reason,—why read vindictive chapters more than sing vindictive psalms? The souls under the altar are represented, in vision, crying, "how long, Lord, holy and true, dost thou not avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" And when Babylon is overthrown, hear the proclamation of the angel,—“rejoice over her, O heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets; for God hath avenged you of her.”

Another objection is, that the name Jesus is not in the Psalms. The name Jesus is not in the translation, but the words "Saviour" and "Salvation," whose meaning the name "Jesus" expresses, are used to render the Hebrew word, from which "Jesus" is derived, according to the reason given by the angel, why the Redeemer was to be called by this name, "because he shall save his people from their sins." But we have a variety of other names in the Psalms, equally descriptive of his glorious character; in the second Psalm he is called the "Anointed," which the Apostle Peter, in quoting the passage, translates "Christ." Acts. iv. 26—"The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord, and against his Christ." The name or title, "Lord," is given to the Saviour in the Psalms, as well as in the New

Testament. Thus in the hundred and tenth psalm, "The Lord said to my Lord, sit thou on my right hand until I make thy enemies thy footstool;" this also the Apostle Peter quotes, in his first sermon on the day of Pentecost. The same psalm goes on to describe him as the great High Priest and Judge of the nations, himself executing the judgment upon them. The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews also applies the title "Lord," in the hundred and second psalm to Christ: "And thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands." It would be too tedious to mention how often this title, Lord, (Adonai in the original) is supplied to the Lord Christ in the Old Testament Scriptures, and in the Psalms.

As to the Hymns and Paraphrases, I never could see any authority from Scripture for introducing them into the most solemn part of religious worship. One argument for paraphrases is, that any part of Scripture may be paraphrased as well as the Psalms. This would be an argument if the Psalms were paraphrased, but a translation is not a paraphrase. Every person who knows any thing of composition or language, knows that a poem would translate into poetry in another language more easily than any piece of prose would. Besides the metrical version in general use in Scotland and Ireland (allowed by all persons of taste to be the best yet in use) is not a paraphrase. In some places there are a few words added, sometimes the words merely transposed to answer the verse, but there is never any change of sense; and where there are additional words, they sometimes bring out the meaning of the original better than the prose translation. For instance in the second psalm, verse sixth, the prose is: Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion;" the metrical version is:—

"Yet notwithstanding I have him
To be my King appointed;
And over Sion my holy hill
I have him King anointed."

The Hebrew word means setting apart, by anointing, as it was usual in ancient times to set prophets, priests, and kings apart to their offices: so that here is no paraphrase, but a more accurate translation than the prose.

Another thing to be considered is, are these things, which it has become fashionable to introduce instead of Scripture, agreeable to Scripture? At present I shall only take notice of two of the paraphrases usually bound up with our Bibles and Psalm-books

VOL. IX.

The very first, although there is nothing in it contrary to Scripture has yet scarcely any resemblance to the first chapter of Genesis. That chapter has been quoted by writers on taste, as an example of the sublime; but they would look in vain for sublimity in the paraphrase. In the description of the creation, we read of a firmament, but not one word about clouds; the paraphrastist does not seem to have been aware, that the first earth were not the same with "the heavens and earth that now are, and "are reserved unto fire." But the more exceptionable one is the forty-fourth, which I understand is often sung at communions:—

"Behold the Saviour on the cross,
A spectacle of woe!
See from his agonizing wounds,
The blood incessant flow!

Is this Scripture language? or is there a single word to countenance it from the one end of the Bible to the other? The writers of the gospels give a plain history of the sufferings of Christ, without using any expression to draw forth our pity or commiseration. This is a soul-ruining delusion too much practised from the pulpit. When the apostles speak of the cross of Christ, they do it with joy and triumph, without a single word to work upon the human sympathies. If a sinner be really awakened to a sense of his sin, he will be able to estimate the load of suffering which the Saviour endured, without such artificial excitement; and if he be not awakened, this tragic emotion will soon wear off, without producing any permanent good. Mankind in their natural state are so selfish, that unless they feel wants or danger to themselves, the sufferings of any person, whether divine or human, will make little impression upon their hearts. The people of God under the first dispensation were taught to take the same view of the sufferings of the promised Saviour, by the rejoicing over the substituted sacrifice; for, while the sacrifice was offering up, the priests were singing around the altar. We have a minute account of this rejoicing in a time of revival of religion in the days of Hezekiah, king of Judah, 2 Chron. xxix. 27, 28, where it is recorded, that the priests and singers praised, and sounded with trumpets all the time the offering was consuming upon the altar. But we find this very people so far degenerated afterwards, as to turn this rejoicing into mourning in the days of Malachi, in whose writings (chapter ii. verse 13) we hear the Lord's reproof, by his prophet, for this as well as other sins:—"And this have ye done, covering the altar of the Lord with

tears, with weeping, and with crying out, in so much that he regardeth it not any more, or receiveth it with good will at your hands."

To sum up the argument between Psalms on the one hand, and Hymns and Paraphrases on the other, in one word—Can faith rest on any thing but the word of God alone? If we then sing any thing else but the words of divine inspiration, we lose the comfort and delight of the exercise.

Christians of the present day, in a great many places, have also degenerated in their *manner* of singing. When singing, instead of being viewed as a high privilege and delightful exercise, is looked upon rather as a prologue or epilogue to the discourse of a preacher, "it does not matter much *what* is sung. A person accustomed to worship along with an assembly of Christians, joining with one voice and apparently with one heart, feels very unhappy, as I can testify from experience in one of those meeting-houses where the new-fashioned refinements are introduced, where the precentor in his official robe, with perhaps a choir along with him, stands up and sings a few verses, while the congregation, with the exception of a few in the gallery, remain as mute as the seats they occupy. Such a person is almost tempted to say—"Is this a church of Christ? or can these be Christians?" If Christians assemble together *only as spectators or hearers*, without desiring to worship the Lord with all their heart, with all their strength, and with all their soul, it is no wonder that they reap little benefit.

That these few hints may call the attention of Christians to this important subject, is the sincere wish of

CHRISTIANA.

INABILITY.

(Extract from Anderson's Letters.)

SOME who profess to teach Calvinistic doctrines, have offered such explanations of the inability of fallen man to do what is spiritually good as appear to deviate from the principles of the reformation. The common objection of the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians is to this purpose: "To suppose that God commands what we have no ability to perform, is to represent him as unjust. We cannot be under a moral obligation to do what is not in our power." In answer to this objection our old divines commonly observed, that, though God could not, consistently with his justice and goodness, require of man any obedience, which he had not ability, in the state wherein he was

created, to perform; yet, when man by the fall had wilfully thrown away that ability, God did not thereby lose his right of requiring obedience.* But this answer is now deemed insufficient. Our new divines pretend that the objection is better answered, by distinguishing between natural and moral ability; alleging, that men, in their fallen state, have still a *natural* ability to believe in Christ, to repent of sin, and to perform every other duty acceptably; but have no *moral* ability to do so. On this point it may be useful to offer a few observations.

1. There are indispositions and inabilityes of body and mind, which are not, in themselves, contrary to the holy law of God; such as the inability of an idiot to acquire knowledge, the inability of the blind to read the scriptures, the inability of the heathens to comply with the offers of salvation, which they never heard. Such inabilityes may be called *physical* or *natural*: they are not, in themselves, contrary to the holy law of God, which by no means, requires what is thus physically impossible. We are far from saying, that the inability of fallen man to do what is spiritually good, is *natural* in this sense: for every one must allow the inability of those who are grown up and have the exercise of reason, to know their Creator aright, and to love him above all things, according to the external revelation which is actually made to them in his works, and especially in his word, to be of a quite different kind from the inabilityes just now mentioned. This inability, considered as, in itself, contrary to the holy law of God, may rightly be called *moral* inability. But it may also be justly called *natural*, as the whole nature of man is subjected to it; as it is the want of that original righteousness, which was natural to man, till he lost it by the fall; as it is so absolute, that no man, before a change of nature in saving conversion, can exert a single act spiritually good; *every imagination of the thoughts of his heart being only evil continually*. Thus, though we allow, that the unregenerate man's inability to believe in Christ is moral and voluntary, so that he alone is the blameable cause of it; yet it cannot be justly called *moral* in opposition to *natural*, as now explained; or, as if the act of the will in refusing to close with the gospel-offer,

* Frustra se opponunt Pelagiani et Semi-Pelagiani omnes; objicientes, Deum sic in mandatis fore injustum, et hominem in peccatis excusabilem. Respondetur, neutrum sequi, quia impotentia hominis est culpabilis, et voluntarie contracta, per quam Deus jure suo non excidit. Marckii Medulla, capite xv.

were the only bar or hindrance to his attainment of saving faith; for that act itself is hindered *negatively*, by the want of that supernatural grace, which being withheld, it is impossible: and *positively*, not only by the will, but also by the corruption of the whole nature, by which the will in the unregenerate is so completely enslaved, so bound as with a chain, that it can do nothing towards its own deliverance.*

2. If the spiritual impotence, which man

* Licet dubium non sit, impotentiam istam voluntariam esse et culpabilem, ut nemini nisi homini soli ejus causa adscribenda sit. Non potest tamen dici absolute, solam hominis voluntatem prohibere quo minus credat, quia, ut *negative* id quoque prohibet carentia et privatio gratiæ, qua posita crederet, et sine qua impossibile est eum credere; ita *positive* id prohibet etiam, non simpliciter ejus voluntas, sed nativa ista corruptio, quæ voluntatem infecit, et qua, veluti catena spirituali, peccato ita mancipatur, ut illam ex se & suis viribus sine gratia abrumperet et excutere nunquam possit.

Turretini Institutionis, Loco decimo, Quæstione iv. Th. 41.

If man's inability to do what is spiritually good were only moral in the sense now explained, then we might admit the Pelagian opinion that no other cause is necessary to saving conversion than moral suasion. The Arminian scheme is, at bottom, much the same with the Pelagian: for whatever internal work of the Spirit they acknowledge, they still insist that it has no other effect, with regard to the will, than that of persuasion; the will, according to them, having sufficient ability to choose what is spiritually good. Nay, some professed Calvinists, such as John Cameron, who taught divinity at Saumur in France in the first part of the 17th century, and his followers, seem to have gone into the same opinion. For, though they allow the work of the Spirit to be always victorious in the case of the elect, yet they ascribe the whole success of it to a high degree of moral suasion. But the Reformers in the 16th century, and such as adhere to their doctrine, acquiescing in the simplicity of the scripture on this head, maintained, that, in order to conversion, a real creation is necessary, though not of the substance of the soul, yet of those gracious habits and dispositions, without which it is as incapable of acts spiritually good, as a dead body is of performing the actions of a living man. This new creation extends to all the faculties of the soul, on account of the total corruption of our nature. Such is the doctrine of the tenth of the thirty-nine articles of the church of England. "The condition of man after the fall of Adam is, that he cannot turn or prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God. Wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God,—without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will,—and working with us, when we have that good will." To the same purpose in the ninth chapter of the Westminster Confession of Faith, it is declared, that "Man by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost ALL ABILITY OF WILL to any spiritual good accompanying salvation: so as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able by his own strength, to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto."

has contracted by the fall, be no more than the want of inclination or willingness to do what is spiritually good; then it is no more than such inability as that of a man in perfect health to go out of his house; or that of a good scholar to write, when he has no inclination to do so. As it would be manifestly absurd to express the want of inclination in these cases by saying, he *cannot* go out of his house, he *cannot* write; so if the spiritual impotence of fallen man were no more than what is now represented, it would be no less absurd, to say, as the scripture does, He *cannot* come to Christ, he *cannot* please God; he has *no strength, no life in him*. John vi. 44. 53. Rom. v. 6. viii. 8. Upon that supposition, there would appear to be no room for the apostle's distinction between being *actually not subject* to the law of God, and being *utterly incapable* of subjection to it; and between God's *working in us to will* and his *working in us to do*. Rom. viii. 7, Philip. ii. 13.

3. It is much to be observed, that, according to the Scripture, man's spiritual impotence lies in the understanding as well as in the will, 1 Corinth. ii. 14. *The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned*. If it be said, that the things of the Spirit of God are foolishness to the natural man, because he wilfully misrepresents them; no, says the apostle, it is because *he cannot know them*: and farther, if it be said, that it is only from his inattention, that he cannot know them; the apostle answers, that this inability cannot be remedied by any efforts of the natural man, but only by the supernatural illumination of the Holy Spirit: *they are discerned spiritually*, by that new capacity of understanding which is given us by the Holy Spirit in regeneration. To this purpose is that which Moses said to Israel towards the end of the forty years during which they sojourned in the wilderness, *The Lord hath not given you an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear unto this day*. It is true, that wisdom and knowledge are often in scripture to be understood practically, as including the will's approbation of and delight in the object known; as in Job. xxviii. 28. *Unto man he said, Behold, the fear of the Lord that is wisdom, and to depart from evil is understanding*. But in such passages the understanding is undoubtedly commended as directing the will to depart from sin and adhere to the path of duty, a holy practice being both the effect

and evidence of a savingly enlightened understanding.

4. It is a dangerous error to say, "That if men are unable to understand, believe and love the gospel in a saving manner, then they must be unable to shut their eyes against it, to disbelieve and reject it." For, according to the scripture, men's natural inability to perform any duty, instead of rendering them unable to practice the contrary sin, disposes them to practise it more and more. Thus, the more unable men are to discern the truth in a saving manner, the more do they shut their eyes and ears against it. The Jews, in the time of our Saviour and his apostles, were unable to understand, believe and love the gospel in a saving manner, not only from the common depravation of human nature, but also from a peculiar efficacy of God's righteous judgment upon them, John. xii. 38, 39, 40. Rom. xi. 7, 8, 9, 10. Did it follow, that they were unable to shut their eyes against, to disbelieve and reject the gospel? Quite the contrary; for by means of that judicial induration, their opposition to the gospel was increased, till wrath came upon them to the uttermost. The defenders of the doctrine of grace against the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians have shewn abundantly, that, in order to justify God in condemning fallen men for their unbelief and other sins, it is by no means necessary to suppose, that they have still, in their fallen state, sufficient ability to perform the opposite duties in an acceptable manner.

If it be asked, how can men, who are unable of themselves to believe in Jesus Christ, be justly condemned upon this ground, that they had ability and lost it in the first Adam; since Adam himself, in his upright state, could not be said to have had faith in Jesus Christ; We answer, that the law, which was written upon man's heart in his creation, bound him to believe whatever God reveals. But the general duty of believing whatever God reveals, comprehends the more particular duty of believing the gospel upon the proposal of it: and by whatever means we lost ability for the former belief, by the same means we lost ability for the latter.

If it be said, that sinners are hereby rendered secure by fixing the guilt of their conduct upon their father Adam; We answer, that, while men are not brought to humble themselves for their sin in Adam, they are not duly exercised in humbling themselves for any other sin. The doctrine of man's natural inability to do what is spiritually good, is only abused, when persons make it a pretence for

their slight thoughts of actual sins:—when they are not filled with a self-abasing sense of their helpless and lost condition; and when they are not thus excited to look for all their salvation in Jesus Christ, as exhibited in the gospel. Besides, when sinners are hardening themselves in their pernicious courses; though they may occasionally attempt to excuse themselves from the doctrine of man's natural impotence; yet they give sufficient evidence that they disbelieve it, by the large promises of repentance and reformation, which they usually make when under convictions; and by their delaying the work of turning from sin to God, as if it were a work which they have sufficient ability for doing at any time. The truth is, the case of natural men under the gospel-dispensation is like that of a servant, who, while he labours under a disease that renders him incapable of serving his master, has at the same time, such an aversion to the service, that rather than return to it, he chooses to continue under his disease. Unrenewed men are totally impotent as to any act that is spiritually good; and they have a reigning enmity against the only remedy of their impotence.

To what has now been observed on this point, it may be of use to add a quotation from a valuable writer, whose praise is in the churches*. "The learned Amyraldus," says he, "did no service to the cause of the reformation by his distinction between a physical and a moral power of believing in Christ. He supposed the sinner to have the former, but not the latter. He held, that Christ died for all men according to a decree of God, by which salvation was secured to sinners upon condition of their faith; which general decree according to him, was to be considered as going before the particular decree, about giving faith to the elect. When it was objected to him, that his notion of the general decree now mentioned was absurd, as it suspended the end of Christ's death upon an impossible condition;—he denied, that the condition was impossible. For, said he, *though I do not, with the Arminians, deny the impotence of fallen man, or his inability to believe, (I allow him to be morally impotent;)* yet I hold that man has still a physical or natural power of believing; as he possesses the natural faculties of the understanding and the will. Herein Amyraldus has given a sad example of the abuse of great parts. Shall we suppose, that when Christ under-

*Lydecker de Veritate Religionis Reformatæ et Evangelicæ, Lib. ii. Chap. 6. Sect. 82.

took for sinners in the covenant of grace, he considered them any otherwise than as most miserable, lost, dead in sin, utterly impotent, Rom. v. 7, 8. viii. 3. or that the wisdom of God gave Christ to die for this end, that sinners might attain salvation by a natural power of believing; a power, which, Amyraldus confesses, could never be exerted? Farther, is not faith a most holy and moral act, and, as it takes place in the sinner, purely supernatural? and shall we allow, that a principle which is not moral, but merely physical, can be productive of such a moral and supernatural act? Ought not an act and its principle to correspond with one another? Let the same thing be said of love, which Amyraldus has said of faith, and the Pelagians will triumph; who used to speak so much about a natural faculty of loving God above all things. Indeed upon this scheme, there will be no keeping out of the Pelagian opinion about the powers of *pure nature*, and about *physical or natural faculties in man of doing what is morally good*. For, in confuting that opinion, our Divines still maintained, that the image of God was requisite in the first man, in order to his exerting such morally good acts as those of loving and seeking true blessedness in the enjoyment of him. But Amyraldus overthrows this doctrine, while he is led, by the distinction he makes between natural and moral power, to hold, that the conception of man's rational nature necessarily includes in it a power of exerting acts morally good, such as those of desiring and endeavouring to obtain the restoration of communion with the infinitely holy and blessed God. The tendency of this scheme became more manifest, when Pajonius, a disciple of Amyraldus, began to deny the necessity of the Spirit's work in the internal illumination of sinners, in order to their saving conversion. For, said Pajonius, nothing more is necessary to that end, than that the understanding, which has in itself a sufficiency of clear ideas, (according to the language of the Cartesian Philosophy then in vogue,) should only be struck by the light of external revelation, as the eye is struck by the rays of light coming from a luminous object."

This quotation may lead to useful reflections on the connexion between the opinion before mentioned and several other errors which have been broached, in opposition to the purity of gospel doctrine.

[From the *Christian Spectator*.]

POPERY AND PAGANISM.

In an interesting chapter on popery, Mr.

Douglas has unfolded its nature and origin at considerable length. That system of religion, in its root and substance, is the same as the paganism of ancient Rome. Its doctrines and practices have here and there a slight similitude to christianity, "a thin disguise," through which we recognize at once the body of that very superstition which, for several centuries, resisted the religion of the cross; a circumstance which proves that where that resistance ceased, it was by an incipient process of amalgamation between the two systems, not by the triumph of one over the other. Were the public mind in our country thoroughly possessed with correct information and right views of the religion of pagan Rome,—such information as classical studies might impart,—the likeness of popery to that religion would appear so striking, so indisputable, that Roman catholics would have no hopes of success among us. We will present a few of the points of similarity, but enough to verify the remarks just made. Our authorities are, the work under review, and the "Vestiges of ancient manners and customs, discoverable in modern Italy and Sicily," by Rev. John James Blunt.

First, the old Romans held the doctrine of a purgatory.

"Lo! to the secret shadows I retire,
To pay my penance till my years expire.
Proceed, auspicious prince, with glory crown'd,
And born to better fates than I have found."
He said; and, while his step, he turn'd
To secret shadows, and in silence mourn'd.
The hero looking on the left, esp'y'd
A lofty tow'r, and strong on ev'ry side
With treble walls, which Phlegethon surrounds,
Whose fiery flood the burning empire bounds:
And press'd betwixt two rocks, the bellowing noise
resounds.
Wide is the fronting gate, and rais'd on high
With adamant columns, threatens the sky.
Vain is the force of man, and heav'n's as vain,
To crush the pillars which the pile sustain.
Sublime on these a tower of steel is rear'd;
And dire Tisiphone there keeps the ward,
Girt in her sanguine gown, by night and day,
Observant of the souls that pass the downward
way.
From hence are heard the groans of goshes, the
pains
Of sounding lashes, and of dragging chains.

Dryden's Virgil. Book VI.

The scheme which is only here hinted at, Dante gives us in detail; and it is worthy of notice that he takes the Mantuan bard his guide through the regions of purgatory. We may trace, moreover, the emanative system of pantheism in this doctrine. According to that system, all spirits are emanations from one great fountain of being, and becoming contaminated by their connection here with matter, which is the only thing

that is evil, need to be purified by the action of fire, and when thus purified, return again to their original source. Thus the Roman catholic believes, and the restorationist with him, after the example of the Gnostics of old, that the endurance of pain for a limited season, will reform the vices of the wicked, and prepare them for the joys of heaven. The latter do not indeed believe that the soul, after purification, is literally and truly merged into the divine being, as the emanative system, strictly interpreted, teaches; but with this exception, the resemblance is complete.

In the second place, the multiplication of deities furnishes a striking resemblance between the religion of ancient and modern Rome. In the mythology of antiquity, the elements, and even the common operations of nature, were personified, and worshiped as Gods, but especially the spirits of departed heroes. In the polytheism of the Roman catholics, saints take the place of the deities of old—they preside over fountains, effect cures, rule the elements, and protect the lives and fortunes of their votaries. The deification of illustrious men, in particular, has been imitated in the canonization of saints. As the superstition of the ancient Romans led them to place the images of their Gods, at the corners of streets, at the entrance of houses, or beside their couches, so the superstition of the modern Italians shows itself in precisely the same manner. The figure of a saint or a Madonna is every where as common now as that of a god in old Rome; and the situations in which they are found, and the powers attributed to them, are strikingly similar.

Pagan Rome was idolatrous. So is papal. Of this it were sufficient evidence to refer to the deification of the *Virgin Mary*. She is called the *Mother of God*, and worship above the reverence due to any created being, is paid to her image. To her is assigned the providential government of the world. In danger, the catholic implores her assistance; for deliverance he renders her acknowledgment. Throughout Italy and Sicily, are temples and chapels almost innumerable, dedicated, not to God, but to the Madonna. An essential agency in human salvation is ascribed to her. None can become partakers of the favor of God and life without her interposition. A similar place in kind, but lower in degree, is given to the *saints*. Prayer is made to them, as to the virgin, temples and altars are erected, and idolatrous homage is paid. The appropriate influence of this system of idolatry may not be felt by every catholic. With

Pascal and Fenelon, and men of that stamp, its influence was counteracted by that of the truth. With them it ceased to be idolatry.* But the mass of the Roman catholics do make a goddess of the Madonna, and gods of their saints. It is a practical deification, as far as the nature of the human mind, and the truth in the case, will permit it to be. The coincidence between the idolatry of ancient and that of modern Rome, however, exists not merely in the general fact; it runs through a great variety of particular circumstances. The virgin has taken the place of the ancient Goddess Cybele. That goddess was called the mother of the gods;† peculiar honors were paid to her in Rome, and the day of her festival, was the same as that of our lady‡. The points of resemblance between the ancient deities and the modern saints, are many. First, in their original character. The gods of the Romans were often mortals, who, after their death, were supposed to be exalted to that rank, on account of their great deeds or virtues. So with the saints of the Italians. Secondly, in their number. Italy of old was filled with temples to her various deities; churches now are no less numerous, to the Madonna, or some particular saint. Different temples were consecrated to the same god, under different titles; different churches are now dedicated to the same object of worship under various names. Thirdly, in the places and things over which they preside. The gods of old were supposed to delight in particular islands, hills, fountains; so it is now with the saints in an equal degree. Every spring or mountain of any note remains as sacred as it was in classical antiquity, and has its presiding saint, as it once had its presiding divinity. In their supernatural powers. The Romans had their gods of medicine and health, who performed miraculous cures; the saints of modern days, it is well known, are thought to do no less. In their moral character. The ancients never scrupled to represent their gods as wicked in the last degree; in this respect, the legends of the saints fall not much short of a parallel. In the use made of their images. The Romans always had images of their gods in their houses, in markets and other public places, at the intersection of streets, etc.: these were generally small statues; and pictures of the Madonna or a saint, now answer precisely the same purposes, and in the same manner. The same pagan temple often con-

*Very questionable.—ED. MON.

†Mater Deorum, Berecynthia Mater.

‡Vestiges, &c. chap. 2.

tained many altars for the worship of different deities; so it is now with the same church. Dr. Middleton derives this popish practice from the similar use of the Romans, "because there never was an example of it but what was paganish before the times of popery," but abundance of them in paganism. The heathen temple, moreover, was often stripped of its gods, only to make way for as many saints. The same acts of worship are performed to popish saints, as were of old to heathen gods,—the lighting up of candles, the burning of incense, making votive offerings and prayers.

The high priest of popery derives his style and title, as well as his rank and power, from the sovereign pontiff, (Pontifex Maximus,) of old Rome, and not from St. Peter. We argue this on the principle of similarity. The pope claims not only infallibility, but supreme power and authority, in all matters civil and ecclesiastical. This is word for word the same that might be said of the Pontifex Maximus, "whose authority and dignity was the greatest in the republic, and who was looked upon as the arbiter or judge of all things, civil as well as sacred, human as well as divine."

Next let us compare the rites and ceremonies of pagan, with those of papal Rome. The most prominent article, in the religious services of the Romans, was sacrifice; the victim in which was called *hostia*. The mass of the Roman catholics is a sacrifice also, (sacrificio della Messa,) and the wafer which is offered is called Ostia. The attendance of boys upon the officiating priest during the celebration of mass, and the frequent ringing of bells, are likewise relics of paganism.

We shall pursue the parallel between the popery of modern, and the paganism of ancient Rome, no farther. We have presented it so much in detail, only because such a course is indispensable to produce the legitimate effect of the truth in this case. A few detached points of similarity in externals might easily be accounted for, without seriously implicating the character of popery; and therefore, would not constitute legitimate proof of its pagan origin. But when the whole spirit and structure, the essential, as well as incidental parts of the system, are seen to be any thing but christian, and plainly borrowed from the religion of ancient Rome, the inference is not to be avoided—popery is not christianity, not like it, except in a few names, and part of its dress. The *things* remain as they were in the midnight of pagan superstition. They are baptised, but

not changed. From the crown of the head to the sole of the foot, the sin and corruption of idolatry still reign with undiminished sway. Such is the view which should now be taken of it by the christian world. It should be placed upon the same footing with the religion of the Hindoos, the Chinese, or the followers of Mahommed.

THE SYNOD OF PHILADELPHIA.

This Ecclesiastical Body, has refused to acknowledge, the *Second Presbytery of Philadelphia*, which had been organised, in pursuance of an act of the last General Assembly, on the principle of elective affinity. The following proceedings of the Synod, which are taken from the *PRESBYTERIAN*, will show our readers, that a majority of that Court feel unwilling to submit to the unconstitutional (or rather unscriptural) acts of the Assembly. This affair, unless the next Assembly reverse the deed complained of, will probably terminate in a secession from that Judiciary.

LEWISTOWN, Oct. 25th, 1832, 11 o'clock, A. M.

The Synod of Philadelphia met agreeably to adjournment, in the Presbyterian Church, and was constituted with prayer.

The Moderator, the Rev. GEORGE JUNKIN, then preached the Synodical sermon from 2 Tim. i. 13. "Hold fast the form of sound words."

The Synod agreed to have a recess until 3 o'clock P. M.

3 o'clock, P. M.

After recess, resumed business.

The following paper was presented by Mr. Engles, for the purpose of completing the roll, which being seconded by Mr. Winchester, was discussed by paragraphs.

"Whereas information has been given to the Synod of Philadelphia, that the General Assembly at their late sessions, did at the request of certain members of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, set them off to be constituted into a new Presbytery, under the style and title of the *Second Presbytery of Philadelphia*, therefore

"*Resolved*, 1. That the *Second Presbytery of Philadelphia*, so constituted, be recognised as a constituent member of this Synod.

"*Resolved*, 2d. That while the Synod by this recognition of the *Second Presbytery of Philadelphia*, express their submission to the aforesaid act of the General Assembly, they deem it to be their indispensable duty, as well as their constitutional right to express their most solemn conviction, that the formation of said Presbytery, was an encroachment upon the right of the Synod, and an

infringement of the constitution of the Church in relation to the formation of new presbyteries.

"*Resolved*, 3d. That, Messrs. ——— and ———, be a committee to draft a memorial to the General Assembly praying them to review the proceeding complained of at their next sessions."

The introduction of the above resolutions being objected to, as out of order, till the roll was completed, the Moderator decided that it was in order. Mr. Duffield called on the Moderator to decide, whether the brethren of the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia were excluded from the house. The Moderator, having refused to decide, and having referred the matter to the Synod, as being the subject under discussion, Mr. Duffield objected to the discussion going on. The Moderator decided that the discussion was in order. Mr. Duffield and Mr. Gilbert then appealed from the decision of the chair, which appeal was not sustained.

The reading of the communication from the Synod of Cincinnati being called for and objected to, the Moderator decided that it was in order, being on the docket and relating to the subject under discussion, whereupon an appeal was taken from the decision of the chair, and the appeal was not sustained.

The first paragraph was under consideration until 5 o'clock, P. M.; when it was resolved to adjourn until to-morrow morning, at half past 8 o'clock. Concluded with prayer.

Friday Oct. 26th, 1832, 8½ o'clock A. M.

The Synod met according to adjournment, and was opened with prayer.

The roll was called with a view of completing the same.

The unfinished business of yesterday was resumed, and the consideration of the first resolution continued.

Mr. M'Ginley requested and obtained leave of absence, after the session of this morning.

After mature deliberation, the yeas and nays were called for.

The Moderator having decided that the members claiming seats in the Synod from the second Presbytery of Philadelphia had no right to vote,—an appeal was taken, and the decision of the chair sustained.

Yeas—Messrs. Belville, Steel, Winchester, Engles, Magraw, Barr, Gilbert, Morrison, Dickey, Cathcart, Kennedy, Sharon, Grier, Duffield, Dewitt, M'Kinley, M'Cachren, Quay, Coulter, Linn, Woods, Peebles, Bishop, Hood, Todd, Dunlap, Stone.

—*Ministers*; P. Trimble and Grier, *Elders*—29.

Nays—Messrs. Potts, Latta, M'Calla, Hoff, M. Williamson, Boyd, Smith, J. Latta, Douglass, Rutter, Moody, J. Williamson, M'Knight Williamson, M. B. Patterson, Creigh, J. C. Watson, Hutchinson, Galbraith, Hill, M'Kinney, Collins, Annan, Bryson, J. B. Patterson, Painter, Barber, J. S. Grier, *Ministers*; and Messrs. M'Ewen, Dunwoody, Graham, Cassat, Irwin, Shoemaker, Wilson, Williams, M'Coy, M'Allister, Kyle, G. Stewart, Rankin, Kerr, J. P. Sanderson, Clark and Long, *Elders*—44.

So the motion was lost; and it was resolved to postpone for the present the remaining resolutions.

Dr. Cathcart, and others gave notice of their intention to protest, and complain to the next General Assembly.

The Synod proceeded to elect a Moderator, when the Rev. JAS. LINN, of the Presbytery of Huntingdon, was duly chosen; Messrs. Belville and Steel were appointed Clerks. Agreed to have a recess until 3 o'clock P. M.

3 o'clock, P. M.

After recess, resumed business.

Mr. Barr offered the following resolution.

Resolved, That the Rev. Dr. Ely, Rev. Mr. Patterson, Rev. Albert Barnes, and Dr. Henry Neill, an Elder from the First Church in Philadelphia, be entered on the roll.

It was then moved to add the words "as members of the Presbytery of Philadelphia;" and after discussion it was moved and seconded to postpone indefinitely this whole subject. The yeas and nays being called for, were as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Sharon, J. Williamson, M. B. Patterson, Hutchinson, Galbraith, Hill, Annan, J. B. Patterson, Painter, Potts, W. Latta, M'Calla, Hoff, M. Williamson, Junkin, Boyd, Smith, J. Latta, and Douglass, *Ministers*; and Messrs. M'Ewen, Dunwoody, Cassat, Irwin, Wilson, Williams, M'Coy, M'Allister, Kyle, G. Stewart, Rankin, Long and W. Stewart, *Elders*—32.

Nays—Messrs. Belville, Steel, Winchester, Engles, Magraw, Barr, Gilbert, Dickey, Cathcart, Kennedy, Moody, R. S. Grier, Duffield, Dewitt, M'Knight Williamson, M'Cachren, Quay, Creigh, Watson, Coulter, Woods, Peebles, Collins, Bishop, Bryson, Hood, Todd, Barber, Dunlap, Stone, and J. H. Grier, *Ministers*; and Messrs. Graham, Trimble, Shoemaker, Kerr, Grier, Sanderson, and Clarke, *Elders*—42.

So the motion for indefinite postponement was lost.

Mr. Winchester then introduced the following resolution which was seconded.

Resolved, That the motion of Mr. Barr be postponed for the purpose of introducing the following.

Resolved, That Dr. Ely, Mr. Jas. Patterson, Mr. Albert Barnes, Ministers, and Mr. Henry Neill, a ruling elder, be recognised as members of this Synod, provided they take their seats as members of the Philadelphia Presbytery : and provided that their thus taking their seats in this body be regarded as a declaration on their part, that they consider themselves as members of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

After some discussion, leave was asked to withdraw the above resolution, which was not granted.

The motion to postpone was then put and carried in the affirmative, and the consideration of Mr. Winchester's motion was continued until half past 5 o'clock, when a motion for recess until 7 o'clock prevailed.

7 o'clock, P. M.

After recess, resumed business.

Messrs. Quay and Bryson obtained leave of absence, after this evening.

After some farther discussion, the previous question was moved and carried in the affirmative : the debate on the main question was then permitted to proceed.

Mr. Winchester then moved to postpone the resolution under consideration, for the purpose of considering the following, viz.

Resolved, That Dr. Ely, Mr. Patterson, and Mr. Barnes, Ministers, and Dr. Neill an Elder, be now enrolled on the minutes of Synod as members of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

The postponement was carried, and it was then moved to add the words, "if they desire it." The yeas and nays being called for, on this amendment, and the call sustained, they were as follows.

Yeas—Messrs. Potts, W. Latta, M'Calla, Hoff, Winchester, M. Williamson, Junkin, Boyd, J. Smith, J. Latta, Douglass, J. Williamson, M'Cachren, M. B. Patterson, J. G. Brackenridge, Hutchinson, Hill, M'Kinney, Collins, Annan, Patterson, Painter, J. H. Grier, *Ministers*; and Messrs. M'Ewen, Dunwoody, Graham, Irwin, Shoemaker, Wilson, Williams, M'Coy, M'Allister, Kyle, G. Stewart, Rankin, Clarke, Long, W. Stewart, John Kerr, *Elders*—39.

Nays—Belville, Steel, Engles, Magraw, Barr, Gilbert, Morrison, Dickey, Rutter, Cathcart, Kennedy, Moody, Sharon, R. S.

VOL. IX.

Grier, Duffield, Dewitt, M'Kinley, M'Knight, Williamson, Creigh, Watson, Coulter, Galbraith, Moody, Peebles, Nourse, Bishop, Bryson, Hood, Todd, Barber, Dunlap, Stone, *Ministers*; and Messrs. Trimble, R. C. Grier, Sanderson—36. So the amendment was carried.

The question on the motion, as amended, was then put and carried in the affirmative.

Agreed to adjourn until to-morrow morning at half past 8 o'clock. Concluded with prayer.

Saturday, Oct. 27th, 8½ o'clock, A. M.

Synod met agreeably to adjournment, and was opened with prayer.

The following paper was presented to the Synod, and ordered to be recorded.

In reply to the resolution of the Synod passed last evening, the subscribers respectfully state, that they have been members of the Synod of Philadelphia for some years past; that the General Assembly has divided them from the presbytery of Philadelphia, and made them members of the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia; that the Assembly has declared said Second Presbytery to be an integral part of this Synod; that they have no disposition to violate their solemn ordination vows, by renouncing the authority of the Supreme Court of our Church; and that as members of this Synod, they desire to take their seats agreeably to the constitution, and retain them in honor and brotherly affection until they are expelled.

EZRA STILES ELY,
JAMES PATTERSON,
ALBERT BARNES,
HENRY NEILL.

Lewistown, Oct. 27th, 1832.

Monday morning, 29th Oct., 8½ o'clock.

Synod met, and was opened with prayer. The roll was called, and the minutes of the first meeting were read.

The communications from the Synod of Cincinnati and Pittsburgh were read, and committed to Mr. Engles and Mr. Douglass.

The Committee to whom were committed the communications from the Synods of Cincinnati and Pittsburgh, respectfully report, that after examination of the said communications, they recommend for the adoption of this Synod the following resolutions :

1. *Resolved*, That this Synod unite with the above named, Synods in remonstrating to the next General Assembly against their act authorizing the formation of the 2d Presbytery of Philadelphia, and that a committee be appointed to draft a remonstrance to be submitted to this Synod.

2. *Resolved*, That in order to give force

to the remonstrance, this Synod reconsider their resolution in relation to the rejection of the said 2d Presbytery of Philadelphia, with the view of adopting a minute like the following—viz.

That this Synod consider it inexpedient to recognize the 2d Presbytery of Philadelphia until they have an opportunity of remonstrating to the next General Assembly, against the constitutionality of their act, in constituting said Presbytery.

It was resolved to consider the report by paragraphs, and after consideration it was on motion,

Resolved, That the first part of this report be adopted, and that Messrs. Engles, and Douglass be a committee to draft the remonstrance.

The Second paragraph being under consideration, it was on motion resolved to stricken out the resolution and recommendation.

3 o'clock, P. M.

After recess, resumed business.

Mr. Engles from the committee appointed on the business, presented the following paper, which was read, and ordered to be laid on the table.

The Synod of Philadelphia convened at Lewistown, Pa., respectfully represent to the General Assembly, that, Rev. E. S. Ely, D. D., Rev. James Patterson, Rev. Albert Barnes and Henry Neill, M. D., appeared before Synod claiming their seats in said Synod, as members of the 2d Presbytery of Philadelphia—recently constituted by an act of the General Assembly, at their Session in Philadelphia, in May last. The motion for the recognition of said Presbytery was fully discussed by the Synod, and the decision was at length adopted, that the aforementioned individuals had no legal claim to a participation in the privileges of this Synod, so long as they urged their claim as members of a Presbytery which, in the opinion of this Synod had no constitutional existence. In pursuing this course the Synod deems it to be due to themselves, as well as to the high character of the General Assembly, to state the reasons which constrained them to assume an attitude which might be misconstrued, as disrespectful to the authority of the Supreme Judiciary of the Church.

The Synod of Philadelphia, sensible of the deference with which the decision of the General Assembly should be regarded, [nevertheless] considered it to be their solemn duty to withhold their concurrence in the act constituting the 2d Presbytery of Philadelphia, as being an infringement of the Con-

stitution which preserves the right of the inferior judicatory. The division of the Presbytery of Philadelphia on the ground of personal partiality, or elective affinity, was a subject of dispassionate discussion, both before the Presbytery and the Synod of which that Presbytery is an integral part, and in both of the judicatories it was decided, that a division upon such grounds, was inexpedient and unconstitutional. *Inexpedient*, in as much as a precedent of this nature, if acted upon generally throughout the Church, must create incurable disorder and irregularity: confound the geographical limits of Presbyteries; erect Presbyteries within Presbyteries; and by affording to individuals differing from their brethren on points of discipline or doctrine, an opportunity to assume a separate ecclesiastical organization, in a certain sense independent, virtually encourage, and promote the division of the Church at large. And *unconstitutional*, inasmuch as the standards of the church in Chap. X. Sec. ii. evidently precludes the idea of elective affinity, in the formation of a Presbytery, when they expressly declare that "a Presbytery, consists of all the ministers and one ruling elder from each congregation *within a certain district*." The Presbytery and Synod, acquainted intimately with all the circumstances of the case, from their local connections had reason to believe that their concurrent decisions of the question upon these grounds, would have been regarded by the General Assembly as final, and now suppose that their rights have not been sufficiently respected by the virtual reversal of their decision by the General Assembly.

But independently of the principle upon which this Presbytery has been divided, the Synod were convinced that they were the only judicatory which had exclusive jurisdiction in the case, and that the decision of the Assembly was accordingly in contradiction to the constitution of the church. Thus while the constitution prescribes that the General Assembly has the exclusive power "of erecting new Synods, when it may be judged necessary," it as explicitly prescribes that Synods have the exclusive authority in "erecting new Presbyteries, and uniting and dividing those which were before erected."

Believing this to be the correct interpretation of the constitution in this case, the Synod have felt it to be their painful, but at the same time their imperious duty to withhold their consent from an act which alike, in their judgment, encroaches upon their rights, and infringes the constitution of the

Church. Submission in the Lord they recognise as their duty; but there are circumstances in which they believe submission to authority would be a virtual dereliction of that higher duty which they owe to their Lord as the great Head of the Church. This Synod holds it as a fundamental principle that every Synod has an indefeasible right to judge of the qualifications of its own members, and can therefore never consent to such an exercise of authority as would deprive them of this right, by obtruding upon them a Presbytery which in their opinion has no legal existence. Whilst therefore they reverence the supreme Judicatory of the church, they most respectfully and urgently remonstrate against the proceeding by which they consider themselves aggrieved, and the reversal of that proceeding they believe to be essential to the peace and purity, as well as to the integrity of the church. They do therefore in the discharge of a solemn and incumbent duty, present this their remonstrance; and in full view of the dangers which impend over the church, whose interests are dear to their hearts, they earnestly pray the General Assembly to review the matter complained of, and to redress the grievance which it has occasioned. And to this end the Synod of Philadelphia do most sincerely implore light and wisdom from the Holy Ghost to direct and guide the Assembly in their deliberations, and to such a decision, as will preserve the unity and purity of our beloved Zion. (Signed)

WM. ENGLES,
ORSON DOUGLASS.

The following is the communication from the Synod of Cincinnati, referred to in the above proceedings. The one from the Synod of Pittsburgh was, we are assured, similar in its nature.

"Extract from the Minutes of the Synod of Cincinnati, Oct. 17th, 1832.

"Resolved, That this Synod highly disapprove of the formation of Presbyteries on the principle of elective affinities, or in any other way in which geographical lines are not regarded: and that, apart from this consideration, the Synod believe that the proceedings of the last General Assembly, in assuming the power of dividing the Presbytery of Philadelphia, were unconstitutional, and fraught with evil consequences to the best interests of the Presbyterian church. We, therefore, complain to the General Assembly of this act of the last Assembly, and do most earnestly and affectionately entreat the Assembly to reverse the decision of the last Assembly by which the Presbytery of Philadelphia was divided; or take such mea-

sures as shall restore the Presbytery to constitutional order. For should the principle of elective affinities be countenanced and confirmed by the highest judicatory of our church, it will be calculated to promote and cherish a resistless spirit throughout the churches; and if the principle be carried out, it must inevitably result in the entire division of the Presbyterian church.

"Resolved, That the purport of this memorial be given to the Synods of Ohio, Pittsburgh, and Philadelphia, with a request that they will take the subject into consideration.

"A true copy. By order,
(Signed) JAS. H. DICKEY,
Stated Clerk of Cincinnati Synod."

From the Orthodox Presbyterian, (Ireland.)

RULING ELDERS.

ONE of the characteristic features of the Presbyterian Church is the office of ruling Elders. By this it is distinguished equally from the despotism of prelacy, and the democracy of independency. And in this order of men, duly appointed and faithfully engaged, lies partly the great power and superiority of Presbyterianism. Like every other blessing, however, it may be perverted into a curse. That it has often been so perverted, cannot be denied. Neither are we ready to maintain that the opinions and practices which commonly prevail, respecting the eldership, are such as we could desire to witness. We fear the ordinary apprehensions of the churches in these times, respecting it, are far below the scriptural standard; and, with a view to bring attention more to the subject, we will in future give some prominence to it in our pages. At present we will submit to our readers a brief sketch of the authority, duties, and qualifications of ruling Elders.

I.—The authority for the office of Elders is derived directly from the Scriptures. This will clearly be seen from the examination of a few passages. "They ordained Elders in every church."—Acts xiv. 23. "Ordain Elders in every city."—Tit i. 5. We remark on these passages, that they suppose a plurality of Elders in every church. There is no reason, however, to suppose that there was more than one Pastor in each church: In the Revelations, the address to the church is through the angel or Pastor. One person was set apart wholly to the work of the ministry, and him the church maintained; but they would have been unable to support more Pastors than one. When,

therefore, we read of Elders in every church, we understand the phrase not of a plurality of Pastors, but of the Pastor and the lay-Elders associated with him in the government of the church. Another passage, in which the authority of this office is implied, is Rom. xii. 6—8. We allude particularly to the clause, "he that ruleth with diligence," in which we conceive there is an allusion to a separate and well-known office, distinguished from that of him who teaches, and of him who ministers, that is, from the Pastor and Deacon. The principle seems to be assumed, that there is in every church, duly constituted, an order of men, whose exclusive business is that of ruling. Indeed the very idea of the government with which Christ has invested his church, necessarily supposes such an order. There must, in every church, be some to rule, and some to be ruled. And the former we conceive to be the Elders of the Presbyterian Church. These views are farther confirmed by 1 Cor. xii. 28. In this passage *government* is mentioned as a distinct and separate office, intrusted to a separate order in the church. Of whomsoever we interpret this expression, the principle is plain, that the office is supposed to exist in the church. And if this be not the eldership of Presbyterianism, what is it? We will add only another passage—1 Tim. v. 17. Here two classes of Elders are described—those who rule merely, and those who labour in the word as well as rule. It seems strange that there should have been any controversy on the authority of the eldership, when the testimony of the Scriptures is so explicit. But what has not been controverted? Let this only lead us to a more diligent study of the Scriptures, that we may be sure our views are formed agreeably to them. And having seen their authority for this peculiarity of our church, let it be our concern to have the order and the office, in all respects, such as the Scriptures require.

But our argument for the authority of the eldership does not end here. We have seen it is scriptural, and it may be satisfactory next to show that it is reasonable. Here, as in every other case, the Scriptures approve themselves to be the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. And this office will be found to be, in all respects, such as the nature and circumstances of the case require. 1. It is necessary for the edification of the church. When any one joins himself to its membership, the first design of so doing is his own edification. This is a sacred tie of duty, by which all the members are bound

to one another. They are associated for the hallowed purposes of strengthening the hands and comforting the hearts of one another. The ignorant are to be instructed, the weak supported, the wavering confirmed, the perplexed directed, the mourning comforted, and the sick tenderly and assiduously visited. But by whom are all these duties to be discharged? Is it by a single Pastor to some hundred persons? That is impracticable. How reasonable that there should be associated with him, for these labours of love, a few of his people who are distinguished above the others by knowledge, prudence, influence, piety, and zeal. The fact that such duties are required, is presumptive evidence that the office has been appointed. It is a great evil when these are supposed to be the duties of the Pastor only. The consequence is they are not, for they cannot be, rightly discharged. Besides the Pastor, in his vain attempt to undertake them, is led to neglect the laborious study of the Scriptures, and careful preparation for preaching the word. We do not wish to relieve him of these duties, but we do wish to see them more effectively discharged than he is able to discharge them; and we do protest against every thing whereby his attention may be diverted from the higher duties of his office. A cry has been got up, in our times, that pastoral visiting is a more important exercise of ministerial duty than preaching the word. But this is either a miserable pretext for the neglect of a most arduous and laborious duty, or it is a melancholy delusion. Visiting we hold to be a most important part of the Minister's duty. But let him never forget that his first, great, and absorbing duty is the public preaching of the word. To that every thing is to be subordinate. Arrangements may be made, whereby he shall have aid in the other duties of his office; but this he must discharge himself. Let his Elders be such men as the New Testament requires for the office, and the more private duties of the ministry will not be neglected. And let preaching be raised to a proper standard, and there will soon be a change in the tone of public sentiment and feeling. 2. The office of the eldership forms a reasonable and equitable balance of power in the church. Human nature is encompassed with weakness and folly. And in all the arrangements of the church, its Great Head has shown his wisdom in guarding, as far as possible, against these evils. If power is in the hands of an individual, we may expect either the abuse or neglect of it; if it is with the multitude, we may

look for confusion and dissension. Let the government of the church be with an individual, and we can expect, from human nature, only either tyranny or licentiousness; let it be with all the members of the church, and we will have discord and contention. The office of the eldership appears to be the happy medium, avoiding the evils and embracing the advantages of both, securing alike the liberty of the people and the respect of their rulers. It is an office, we conceive, not only strictly scriptural, but truly reasonable.

We might farther derive an argument for the Presbyterian eldership, from the government of the Jewish synagogue. It is certain there is a strong resemblance between the government of our churches and that which obtained in the synagogue, in the time of Christ and his apostles. And it is not an improbable opinion, that the Christian church would be built on a model with which the people, in those times, were familiar. Waving this argument, however, for the present, we proceed to consider—

2.—The duties of ruling Elders. We deem it necessary, in entering on this branch of the subject to remark, that we do not expect all the duties of the Elder to be discharged towards all the members of the church with which he is connected. That would obviously require all his time and energy. We suppose there will be a division of labour, and that not more than twenty families will be committed to the superintendence of one Elder. And this arrangement being made, his way is plain and easy before him. Some duties there are which he owes to all; but the laborious duties of his office he can be expected to discharge only towards those of his own district. And these any faithful man can discharge; for there is no man who does not needlessly waste more time than would be necessary to the most diligent and conscientious exercise of the office. These things premised, we will proceed to enumerate the duties of the Elder.

1. His primary duty is to rule the church. This is not done by him alone, but in company with those with whom he is associated. The duty embraces three things—the admission of members to the church, the oversight of those admitted, and the expulsion of the unworthy. In the admission of members, it is the duty of every Elder to be at pains to ascertain the religious knowledge, the sound faith, and the blameless life of the candidate. In general this may be done by learning the report of the Elder in whose

district the candidate is placed, and by attending on the examinations of the Pastor. The oversight of the members may be maintained, not by unnecessarily prying into their private life, but by paying a general attention to the character which they bear in society. And should an evil report spread abroad, respecting any of the members, it is the duty of the Elders to inquire into it; and should they find it to be well founded, and of such a nature as to bring scandal on the Christian profession, or to be inconsistent with it, they must proceed, however reluctantly, to the faithful exercise of discipline, requiring evidence of repentance in him that is guilty, or in the want thereof, excluding him from their membership. It is only by faithful dealing in these three things that the government of the church can be exercised, or its discipline maintained.

2. Another duty of the Elder is teaching. It is plain the Pastor cannot teach all the subjects of his charge, as it is desirable he should. But what important aid may the Elder render here. Let him see that all under his superintendence regularly and punctually attend on the preached word, knowing that however vigilant the Pastor, many will escape his notice. Let him induce all the children, in his district, to attend on the catechetical examinations of the Pastor, which, however convenient the opportunities, many will neglect. Let him see that the servants, within his charge, attend the ordinances of religion, are furnished with copies of the Scriptures, and that they read them. And perhaps it would not be too much, in many instances, to expect that the Elder would devote an hour in the week to the examination of children and servants. By so doing, a faithful, conscientious man would effect much good, and without the loss of almost any time, be an effectual helper to the Minister of the word.

3. It is the duty of the Elder to visit the sick. This, indeed, is the duty of every member of the church, so far as there is opportunity. But particularly it is enjoined on the Elders.—James v. 14. It is their special duty to approach the sick with the tenderness of Christian sympathy, to inquire into their temporal wants, and supply them from the funds of the church, should it be necessary, to embrace the opportunity of impressing the truths of religion on their minds, and to commend them by prayer to God, that he might be pleased to heal their sorrows, and to sanctify them. Surely to a devout mind, such exercises would furnish a most congenial employment. And we

could not but expect that Christ would have required the discharge of such duties from the members of the church, to one another, as well for the benefit of the visitors as of them that are visited.

4. Besides special attention to the sick, there is a general visitation of his district, in which the Elder, accompanied by the Pastor, should engage. This might require three days in the course of every twelve or six months, and surely that will not be considered an extravagant demand. It was the original practice of our Presbyterian forefathers, and it was characterised by wisdom, even all the wisdom of him who sent out his disciples at first, two and two.

5. The Elders are intrusted with the care of the poor. The actual distribution of money seems to belong to the Deacons; but it is the duty of the Elders to inquire into the circumstances of the poor, to provide means for their support, and to concur with the Deacons in ministering to their necessities.

6. Not to multiply duties, we observe, finally, that the Elder is accountable for the general exercise of a faithful superintendence of his district. He is, in some sense, the father of the people. He should therefore study to promote unity and spiritual prosperity among them, warning against dissensions, healing divisions, reproofing the wayward, entreating the sinful, reclaiming the backsliding, encouraging the faint, and, in short, using every means to wean from sin and stimulate to holiness.

"And as a bird each fond endearment tries,
To tempt its new-fledg'd offspring to the skies;
He tried each art, reprov'd each dull delay,
Allur'd to brighter worlds, and led the way."

Nor let the Elders forget, that to them is specially intrusted the originating, and directing, and fostering of all plans for the spread of religion in the church and the world. They are the appointed guardians and patrons of the Sundry-school, the Bible, Missionary and Tract Societies, the Scripture Reader, and the Lending Library. It is when the Elders of the church undertake these duties, and not till then, that they will be effectively discharged. And O! did Elders thus discharge their duties, what a transformation would speedily pass on the church and the world. We would soon have reason to say, "all things are become new."

III.—The character and qualifications of ruling Elders. That this is a matter requiring much attention, is obvious, from the nature of the duties which they are required to dis-

charge. It is plain, also, from the extreme care with which we find church officers were originally appointed, and the attention that was paid to their religious character. Acts vi. 3. And in 1 Tim. iii. 8—13, the Spirit of God is pleased to furnish us with a minute description of the character. The qualifications of Elders may perhaps be comprehended under the three following:—

1. *Personal piety.* It would be a waste of words to prove the necessity of this qualification. In what a state of spiritual degradation must a church be, when its officers are chosen, without regard to their personal piety. When men are elected merely from respect to their wealth and worldly influence, it is a perversion of the authority with which Christ has intrusted his church, the most sinful and wicked; nor will he fail to visit it with his judgments. If these things exist in conjunction with piety, they do not disqualify, they rather recommend, as they may be employed for the interests of religion. But where they exist in Elders, without piety, these are the more disqualified, as thereby they are possessed of greater power of doing evil.

2. *The wise and faithful government of their own families.* It is desirable, though not essential, that the Elder should be the head of a family. This is particularly noticed by the Apostle Paul. And the reason seems to be, that faithfulness in the domestic government is one of the best tests of Christian character, as well as an evidence of fitness for governing in the church. The peculiar qualities that distinguish, in the government of the family, qualify for the government of the church. Such are prudence, good temper, wisdom, zeal, and integrity.

3. *Being of good report with the church and, in ordinary circumstances, with the world also.* The elder should be known and marked as a man of godliness. It is not sufficient that he is harmless, abstaining from the gross vices of the world—it is requisite that he be exemplary in piety and good works. This is necessary, not because of its own worth merely, and its qualifying him for the office, but for the sake of that influence which he ought ever to maintain. Let him live in the hearts of the people, by the affection they bear to his person. Let him rule over the church, by the respect which they entertain for his character.

What cause have we for humiliation when we compare the eldership of our church with what, we have seen, it ought to be. Alas! how fallen! We will not draw the picture, but we call upon our readers to join

with us in confessing how far we are guilty in this thing. Yet let us be thankful that some are faithful and that there is a revival. "Except God had left us a remnant, (in the dreary season through which our church has passed,) we should have been as Sodom, and we should have been like unto Gomorrah." Let us strengthen the things that remain. There is no evil without a remedy. Let us address ourselves vigorously to the work of reformation. God will bless our labours. He will give us men to govern our church, who shall be after his own heart. And then shall our Zion again "look forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners."—Cant. vi. 10.

J. Q. ADAMS' OPINION OF MASONRY.

EX-PRESIDENT ADAMS has addressed four letters, on the subject of Free-Masonry, to Wm. L. Stone, Esq. of New-York. These letters should be read by every member of the community. They are full of good sense and solid reasoning. From the second letter we extract the following:—

DEAR SIR:—Long, and I fear, tedious as you have found my last letter, I was compelled by a reluctance at making it longer, to compress the observations in it upon the *intrinsic* nature of the Masonic *Oaths, Obligations* and *Penalties*, within a compass insufficient to disclose my opinion, and the reasons upon which it is founded.

I had said to you that the Institution of Free-Masonry was *vicious*, in its first step, the initiation *Oath, Obligation* and *Penalty* of the entered apprentice. To sustain this opinion I assigned to you five reasons—because they were:

1. Contrary to the Laws of the Land—Extra judicially taken and administered.
2. In violation of the *positive* precepts of Jesus Christ.
3. A pledge to keep *undefined* Secrets, the Swearer being ignorant of their nature.
4. A pledge to the penalty of death *for* violation of the oath.
5. A pledge to a *mode* of death, cruel, unusual, unfit for utterance from human lips.

If in the statement of these five *objections*, upon principles of Law, Religion, and Morals, there be any thing unsound, I invite you to point it out. But if you contest either of my positions, I must entreat you not to *travel out of the record*.

I might ask you, not to consider it a refutation of either of these reasons, to say that you and all other honest and honorable Masons, have never so understood or practiced upon this Oath, Obligation, and Penalty.

The inquiry is not what your practice, or that of others has been, but what is the Obligation, its Oath, and its Penalty.

I must request of you to give me no *explanation*, of this Oath, Obligation and Penalty, directly contrary to their unequivocal import. That you will not explain *black* by saying that it means *white*, or even alledging that you so understand it. I particularly beg not to be told that honorable, intelligent and virtuous men, George Washington, and Joseph Warren, for example, understood that the penalty of death for Treachery, meant the death of martyrdom for fidelity.

I would willingly be spared the necessity of replying to the averment that the patterns of honor and virtue whom I have just named, with a long catalogue of such men *have* taken this Oath, and bound themselves to this Obligation, under this penalty. For I might deem it proper to inquire, whether the very act of binding such men, by such oath to such obligation, under such penalty, is not among the *sins* of the Institution.

I must ask you to suppose that such an Institution had never existed—that it were now to be formed, and that you were one of ten or twenty, virtuous and intelligent men, about to form a charitable, and convivial secret Association. Suppose a Committee of such a meeting, appointed to draw up a constitution for the Society, report the entered Apprentice's Oath, Obligation and Penalty, as a form of initiation for the admission of Members. I do not ask you whether you would vote for the acceptance of the Report, but what would you think of the Reporters?

I consider this as the true and only Test, of the inherent and essential character of Masonry, and it was under this conviction, that I told you that the entered Apprentice's Oath was sufficient to settle in my mind the immoral character of the Institution.

It is perhaps too much to ask of you, an explicit assent to these positions, because you may consider it an acknowledgment of error. But this is the first and fundamental consideration from which I draw the conclusion that Masonry *ought* forever to be abolished. It is wrong—essentially wrong—a seed of evil, which can never produce any good. It may perish in the ground—It may never rise to bear fruit; but whatever fruit it does bear, must be rank poison—It can never prove a blessing, but by its barrenness.

* * * * *

Judge this system a priori, without re-

ference to any of the consequences which it has produced, and say if human ingenuity could invent an engine better suited to conspiracy of any kind. The Entered Apprentice returns from the Lodge, with his curiosity stimulated, his imagination bewildered, and his reason disappointed. The mixture of Religion and Morality, blended with falsehood and imposture, which pervade all the ceremonies of initiation, is like arsenic mingled up with balm.

"Most dangerous

"Is that Temptation which doth lead us on

"To Sin, in loving Virtue."

If the candidate has been educated to a sincere and heartfelt reverence for Religion and the Bible, and if he exercises his reason, he *knows* that all the tales of Jachin and Boaz, of Solomon's Temple, of Hiram Abiff and Jubela, Jubelo, and Jubelum, are impostures—poisons poured into the perennial fountain of truth—Traditions exactly resembling those reprobated by Jesus Christ, as making the Word of God of none effect. If, as in this age but too often happens, he enters the lodge a sceptic, the use of the Bible there, if it have any effect upon him, will turn him out a confirmed infidel. The sincere and rational believer in the Gospel, can find no confirmation of his faith in the unwarrantable uses made of the Holy Scriptures to shed an unction of their sanctity around the fabulous fabric of Free Masonry. While the reprobate miscreant will be taught the uses to which fraud and secrecy may turn the lessons of piety and virtue, inculcated in the sublimest effusions of divine inspiration. In those scriptures we are told, that when "the children of Israel did **SECRETLY** those things that were not right against the Lord their God," they became idolaters, and were carried into captivity. Their cities then were soon filled with a mongrel race of Babylonians and Assyrians, who perverted the Word of God with the impostures of Paganism; burnt their children in fire, to the Gods of Sepharvaim, and "*feared the Lord, and served their graven images*"—an emblem of Free Masonry, far more illustrative of its character, than the Tragedy of Hiram Abiff.

The Entered Apprentice's oath, is, therefore, in its own nature, a seminal principle of conspiracy—and this objection applies to the only oath originally taken in all the degrees of Free Masonry at its first institution. The *ostensible* primitive purposes of Free Masonry, were all comprised in *good-fellowship*. But to good-fellowship, whether of labour or refreshment, neither secrecy,

nor oath, nor penalties, are necessary or congenial. In the original institution of Free Masonry, there was then an ostensible and a secret object, and by the graduation of the order, the means were supplied of converting it to any *evil* purpose of associated power, screened from the danger of detection. Hence all the bitter fruits which the institution has borne in Germany, in France, in Mexico, and lastly, in this our beloved country. Nor could they have failed to be produced in Great Britain, but that by sharp and biting statutes, they have been confined within the limits of the ostensible object of the brotherhood—good-fellowship.

I am, with much respect, dear sir, your friend and servant. J. Q. ADAMS.

SCOTT'S FAMILY BIBLE.—We notice with pleasure the following announcement of a new and still cheaper edition of Scott's Family Bible.

This Commentary is highly practical, and by many supposed to be equal if not superior to Henry's. In the main it is considered Calvinistic, and for general use is superior to any other which can be purchased for the same price in the United States.

Messrs. Collins and Hannay, Pearl-street, New-York, have in press and will publish in a few days a beautiful edition of Scott's Family Bible, in three volumes. The goodness of the paper, the clearness of the type, and the reduced price of this edition, entitle it to the immediate attention of all the trade, and of every one who prefers Scott's commentary to the other commentaries now extant.

We learn that the price of this noble edition will not much exceed seven dollars, if any. The first editions printed in this country generally sold at about twenty dollars a copy.—*N. Y. Weekly Messenger*.

ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

THE Associate Presbytery of Albany met at Povina, on the 31st of Oct. ult., and ordained Mr. John Graham to the office of the ministry, and installed him in the pastoral charge of the Associate Presbyterian congregation in that place. The Rev. John G. Smart presided on the occasion, and preached from 1 Cor. ii. 2. The Rev. Peter Campbell delivered the charges. The Presbytery dispensed with sermon in the afternoon, on account of the lateness of the hour to which the services had been protracted. After having finished such other business as came before them, the Presbytery adjourned to meet in Albany on the first Wednesday of May next, at 10 o'clock A. M.

J. M. Elliston

NOTICE TO PATRONS.

Communications, Subscriptions for the work, and remittances of money, should be addressed either to the subscriber, or to the Rev. JAMES MARTIN.

Persons visiting the City, and wishing to pay their subscriptions, can, in the absence of the subscriber, pay them to Mr. ANDREW WHITE, at the old stand, No. 71 State-street, who is authorised to receive money for the Monitor and give receipts.

CHAUNCEY WEBSTER.

Albany, N. Y. June, 1832.

TERMS \$2 00 per annum, payable in advance or at the annual meeting of the Associate Synod.

¶ To PATRONS, AGENTS, &c.—As there is to be no meeting of Synod till next October, and as the present volume will be completed in May next, it becomes necessary for us to request subscribers and agents, to forward as much money as they can conveniently, either for the present or any previous volume not already paid, *by mail*, between this time and the 1st of May next, that we may be enabled to meet our engagements with the printer, &c. It is believed unnecessary to urge this matter, to ensure a compliance with the above request.

¶ Money may be forwarded, *by mail*, at our risk, and at our expense, where more than \$5.00 is enclosed.

ALBANY, Dec. 1832.

AGENTS.

¶ All ministers and preachers of the Associate Church.

In addition to the ministers and itinerating preachers of the Associate church, who are authorized to receive subscriptions and money, and give receipts, the following persons are authorized to act as agents:

Wm. Stevenson, Jun., Cambridge, Washington Co. N. Y.

Joseph M'Clelland, New-York City.

George M'Queen, Esq. Schenectady.

A. Bachop, Argyle, Washington Co. N. Y.

Wm. Dickey, Pittsburgh, Pa.

John Smart, Huntingdon, Pa.

Wm. M. Goodwillie, Barnet, Vt.

Rev. A. Whyte, Jr., Baltimore, Md.

Andrew Munro, Canonsburgh, Pa.

John M'Cleary, York, Livingston Co. N. Y.

Thomas Cummings, Putnam, Wash. Co. N. Y.

James Galloway, Jr., Xenia, Ohio.

James Willson, Esq. Oxford, Pa.

Subscribers in Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri, are requested to make payment to the Synod's Missionaries, who will also receive and forward the names of new subscribers.

A number of extra copies of the 9th volume are being printed under the expectation that they will be called for.